NON-DUALISM IN
ŚAIVA AND ŚĀKTA
PHILOSOPHY

Prof. NUNDO LALKUNDU, M.A., D PHIL

NON-DUALISM IN
ŚAIVA AND ŚĀKTA
PHILOSOPHY

KUNDU

NON - DUALISM IN
ŚAIVA AND ŚĀKTA PHILOSOPHY

Prof. NUNDO LALL KUNDU, M. A. D. PHIL.
Vice-Principal & Head of the Department of Logic and Philosophy
Mahārājā Manindra Chandra College
Calcutta.

Published under the auspices of
Sri Sri Bhairabi Jogeswari Math
1/5, Gour Laha Street,
Calcutta.

Printed by
Sri Anil Kumar Roy
Art Union Printing Works Private Ltd.
80/15, Grey Street,
Calcutta-6.

Price Rs. ***15/-***

This thesis is dedicated to my spiritual preceptor, Kulāchārya Sree Sreemaṭ Kālīkṛiṣhnānanda Giri whose spiritual initiation and guidance in 'Kaula-Mārga' has ever acted as a beacon light in my quest for the perennial Philosophy of mankind.

"Yaṣmiṇ Saṛvaṃ Yataḥ Sarvaṃ Sarvaṃ Sarvameva yaṭ

Yaṣcha Sarvamayaḥ Nityaṃ Tasmai Sarvātṃane Namaḥ"

Āgamah.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Non-dualistic philosophy or Advaita-Vāda is specially associated with the philosophy of Ācarya Śaṅkara. A critical and liberal study of the Sáiva and Sākta Āgamas will, however, reveal that there is a deep and profound non-dualistic approach to the solution of the perennial problem of 'Being' and 'Becoming'. This thesis is based upon a comparative and liberal study of 'Sabda-Brahma-Vāda' as propounded in ancient Vāyakarana and Saiva and Sākta Āgamas. Ācarya Bhṛtṛhari himself was deeply versed in the ancient lore of Sáiva and Sākta Āgamas. His doctrine of 'Sphota' is an authentic version and support of the non-dualistic philosophy of Āgamas and Nigamas.

In this thesis, I have tried to show that Bhrtrhari acknowledged four forms of 'Vāk' i.e. 'Parā', 'Pasyanti', 'Madhyamā', 'Vaikharī', and his 'Parā-Vāk' is indicative of the same Absolute Reality which is integrated, 'Prakāsa' and 'Vimarsa', that is, self-luminosity and self-consciousness as enjoined in Sáiva-Sākta philosophy.

The objections to the doctrine of 'Sphota' by the Naiāikas and the Mimāṃsakas have been carefully considered on a comparative basis in the beginning of the thesis, and I have tried to show that 'Sabda-Brahma-Vāda' seems to be a more satisfactory non-dualistic approach than any other form of Advaitā philosophy. This non-dualistic philosophy of ancient grammar is closely associated with Sáiva and Sākta

doctrine of Parama-Siva or the supreme principle of absolute Consciousness. Ācarya Śaṅkara's Absolute or Brahman is the self-luminous principle but in Sáiva and Sākta philosophy, the Absolute is not only self-luminous but also self-conscious. Of course, Ācarya Śaṅkara acknowledged this truth in his famous 'Ānanda Lahari' and 'Prapancha-sārá Tantra'. This point has also been clearly stated in the thesis. I have also given comparative estimates of the doctrine of Prak ti and Purusa in Sānkhya philosphy and also in Sáiva and Sākta Āgamas which will clearly show that Sáiva-Sākta conception of Purusa and Prakrti seems to be far in advance of the dualistic approach of Sānkhya philosophy in as much as the latter standpoint is more conducive to a non-dualistic philosophy ; for the main tendency of philosophical thought is non-dualism.

The Tantras are essentially mantra-sāstras and the mantras are commonly regarded as mystic syllables without any significance and content and consequently tantrik philosophy and its spiritual practices have not been understood in their proper perspective. That the tantras, or Sáiva Sākta Āgamas have a rich treasurehouse of a very profound non-dualistic philosophical outlook in support of its spiritual and religious practices will be evident from a sympathetic and careful study of what is contained here. The tantras are sādhan-sāstras and the encyclopædia of a rich cultural heritage of India and their religion or religious practices are based on a very liberal and comprehensive synoptic worldview. It is an established truth that in India in explaining religion philosophy has always explained itself.

I conclude my thesis with acknowledging my debt of gratitude to Sri Debobrata Bhattacharjee, B.A. (Hons.), my student of philosophy who has greatly helped me in the preparation of the original manuscript. This thesis is the outcome of sixteen years of patient study, independently carried in the domain of Sáiva and Sākta Āgamas, supplemented by active participation in the spiritual and yogic practices in tantrik cult under the guidance of my spiritual preceptor or Gurudeva to whom this thesis has been dedicated.

"Non-Dualism in Sáiva & Sākta Philosophy"

Introduction

At the outset, I must confess that the subject matter of my thesis constitutes a region hitherto neglected and very little exploded in the domain of Indian Philosophy, as no serious and consistent endeavour has as yet been made to give to the students of Philosophy a well-knit and systematic history, Philosophy and the literature of Sáiva and Sākta Schools of thought. That Sáiva and Sākta Philosophy has played a very important part in the philosophical and religious life of the Indian people and contributed much to India's cultural development has been attested to by eminent scholars and historians. It should be pointed out here that I have not tried to give a consistent historical development of Sáiva and Sākta philosophy, as very little history of those philosophies has been left by our ancient predecessors; on the other hand, I have tried in my own humble way to bring into the focus of our national consciousness the rich legacies of our ancient Sages which have almost sunk into the depth of oblivion due to negligence and apathy. It is to be acknowledged that Sáiva and Sākta cults constitute the Sādhan Sāstras or practical Yoga philosophy of the ancient Indians and these philosophical Systems are the practical outcome of the spiritual realization of the ultimate truths of human life. The Āchāryas were Sādhakas or

illumined souls who realised the eternal truths proclaimed to the world by the almighty Siva for the emancipation of mankind. They were not philosophers in the strict sense of the term, if by philosophy we mean 'reasoned reflection' upon the eternal truths of life and existence. So the difficulty of bringing out a consistent philosophy out of the scattered and mystic sayings of Sáiva and Sākta Ācharyas is immense. Hence I do not claim to have given a very comprehensive and synoptic view of the philosophy of Sáiva and Sākta Āgamas. My thesis is more suggestive than conclusive and I leave it to future students of philosophy to finish the unfinished work which, I think, cannot be accomplished in one single life.

Recent researches in Geology, Anthropology and Ethnology go to prove that "From time immemorial India is the home of the worship of Prakriti or later Sakti" (History of Ancient India—R.S. Tripathi). Now, if we cast a cursory glance at the development of the Indian Culture, we come across two main currents : "Vaidiki Tāntriki chaiva dividhā Kīrtitā Sruti"—(Kullukvatta—commentary on Manu Sanhitā) one current constitutes the Vaidika cult, the other current constitutes the Tāntrik cult. The Vaidik cult or the Aryan cult is male-centric. Hence the Vedas enjoin the worship of male-gods, while the non-Aryans who formed the most primitive people of India before the advent of the Aryans had a cult which was mother-centric. This Tāntrik current is known as non-Aryan cult and their Society and family are matriarchal. Hence th[illegible] enjoined the worship of female goddess. In historico-

anthropological researches the following ethnological groups have been mentioned as pre-Aryans or non-Aryans, e.g.,

(*a*) the Nigrobatu,

(*b*) the Astrich,

(*c*) the Dravidians,

(*d*) The Mongolies or the Tibetian-Chinese.

There is no trace of the Nigrobatu race today, it may be that it must have merged itself into the Astrich races. 'The descendants of the Astrich type are to be found among the Kols, Vils and the Santhals. All these tribes are mother-worshippers. These people were dwellers in the hills and forests, hunting and agriculture was the main source of their livelihood. The Dravidians had a rich culture of their own. There was a time when the Dravidian culture predominated the whole of India. From the north-western frontier down to the north-eastern frontier including Bengal and Assam, and from the Himalayas down to Ceylon, the influence of Dravidian culture and religion had spread. The excavations of Māhenjodāro and Harappa go to prove the past glory and prosperity of the pre-Aryan or the non-Aryan Dravidian civilization. Prof. Marshall and Father Heras and other eminent scholars have unanimously admitted that the founders of the Indus Valley civilization were mother-worshippers. Their religion was marked by an improved method of Yoga practices and mother-worship. "The clay-figures and images and phallic bactylic stones suggest that 'Durga' and 'Siva' worship was of a

much greater antiquity in India than has hitherto been supposed." (Preface to pre-historic ancient Hindu-India by Donald A. Mackenzie). Within the span of fifty years our knowledge of the non-Aryan or non-vedic culture in the evolution, development and enrichment of Indian thought has immensely increased by the discoveries and remnants of past glories of the pre-Aryan civilization. The archeological findings of Māhenjodāro and Harappa go to prove the existence of once prosperous cities as early as about 3000 B.C. Valuable researches regarding the civil, social, political, philosophical and religious life of these people have greatly helped us to come to the definite conclusion that the people of Indus Valley had a highly developed religion of their own which was essentially non-vedic and pre-Aryan in its earliest form. Some of the most important contributions to Hindu religion from the non-vedic or pre-vedic Indus Valley sources are :—(1) The worship of the mother-goddess. That the founders of mother-worship were non-Aryans and that their society was matriarchal in forms, there can be no two opinions about it. In many Aryan scriptures, the goddess forms of the Deity have been regarded as worshipped by non-Aryans, such as Pulendus, Savaras, huntsmen or Kiratas etc. Various forms of the mother-goddess played important parts in the Indus Valley civilization and religion. Thus the predominance of the female aspect of the Divine in this civilization is the non-vedic element which greatly influenced the vedic civilization in later times. (2) Temple-worship was also another prominent feature of the civilization; (3) Elevation of animals, birds, trees, to a higher position in the

scheme of religion is also a noteworthy feature. Various figures have been discovered which emphasise the contemplation of the Divine in a more concrete form . It has already been pointed out that the vedic gods or the Aryan gods were masculine. In the Rig-veda the predominant gods are 'Chandra', 'Surya', 'Maruta', 'Varuna' the fire God etc. They are regarded as omnipotent. There are no doubt mentions of some of the names of the female goddesses like 'Saraswati', 'Ratri' etc., but they dwindle into insignificance before the male gods. All these historical facts and findings go to prove that before the advent of the Aryans, in pre-vedic India the mother-cult was one of the essential features of a non-Aryan civilization which was very rich and enlightened and which forms the quintessence of Tāntrik cult. Sir John Marshall in his epoch-making book, "Mahenjodaro and Indus Valley civilization" concludes that those people worshipped the ultimate Deity in the form of mother-goddess or Sakti and the Male Deity, 'Siva' who is represented as the greatest Yogin. Discoveries of some seals, images, carvings, inscriptions and other signs found in different sizes are living testimonials of this fact. They also worshipped 'Linga', Sun, Animals, Trees which are also prominent features of the Tāntrik worship. The reading of some discovered inscriptions of father Herras also unmistakably proves that Siva and Sakti were the Chief Deities of the Indus Valley civilization which at one time exercised the most profound influence on the religious life of the non-Aryan people of India. In fact, that the non-Aryans were the founders of mother-worship and their

family life was matriarchal in form is an established fact of history in respect of which there can be no two opinions. The cult of mother-worship originating from the aboriginal tribes of pre-Aryan India has like a dynamic current exercised great influence upon all forms of Aryan religion. Its influence can be found in the religions and literature of the Aryans, in Buddhism, in Vaisnava cult and last but not the least, in Bengal which is one of the most celebrated sacred places of the mother-cult. It is also a noteworthy fact that the Atharba Veda which contains many things in common with the Tantras, was not for a long time regarded as forming a part of vedic cult. It contains over and above the mantras, details about magic, spiritual initiations, customary rites relating to Sakti worship. In a word it contains all kinds of practices relating to Sakti Sādhana or Sākta cult in common with the Tantras. If the Atharba Veda is to be regarded as the oldest Vedic literature, as the term Atharba (hoary-headed scriptural testimony) implies and if it contains many important elements in matters of religion, philosophy, customary rites and practices relating to Sakti worship, it may safely be conjectured that the influence of Tantras and Sakti cult was very great on the Atharba Veda. Moreover some of the important Upanisads were greatly influenced by the religion of the aboriginal Dravidian races. In the Upanishads the 'Siva-Sakti' tattva which forms the quintessence of the Tantras has found various expressions and the Sakti cult (worship of the ultimate Reality in the form of Divine mother) has a prominent place. In the Tripura Upanishada there is reference of mother-

worship characterised by 'Pancha-ma-kara Sādhana' or worship of the primordial mother by offerings of wine, meat, fish, vegetable and by 'Kundalini-Yoga'. In the Rig Veda the Divine Mother has been regarded as the ultimate goddess of power, as the first cause of this universe. (Rig Veda 10/125).

In other words the Devi-Sūkta enjoins "I embody in myself all the Gods and the Goddesses, I am the root cause of all, the omniscient, omnipotent, primordial Power, the creator, preserver and the destroyer of the universe." In this hymn we have the first trace of matriarchal religion of the non-Aryans occupying a very honoured place in the Devi-Sūkta or 'Ode to the Divine Mother' contained in the Rig Veda. Here the eternal Divine Mother has revealed herself both in her transcendental and immanent aspects. This is a clear enough pointer to the influence of the Tāntrik cult on the Rig Veda. The 'Ratri-Sūkta' or "Ode to the Divine Mother as Eternal Night" contained in the same Veda is another instance in point. In some of the important Purānas, such as the 'Mārkandya Purāna', the Devi-Bhāgavata, the Kālika-Purāna etc., the Divine Mother is regarded as the one ultimate Reality without a second. It is an indubitable fact that worship of the ultimate Deity in the form of Divine Mother is the exclusive spiritual and religious property of the Tantras. Its metaphysics, philosophy and religions constitute the essence of the pre-Aryan or non-Aryan civilization. The aboriginal tribes whose family and social organisation were predominantly matriarchal, and whose religion was mother-centric, were the first founders of the Tāntrik cult.

It is a remarkable fact to be noted here that nowhere in some of the oldest Tantras such as the 'Malinivijay Tantra' the 'Rudra-Yamala' etc. no trace of the Vedic influence and no mention of the Vedas can be found; whereas in the Vedas we have clear evidence of Tāntrik influence or the influence of 'Āgama' and 'Nigama' which go to prove that before the Aryans migrated to the Indian soil, the Tantras and the Tāntrik cult were there as forming the core of the Non-Aryan or the Pre-Aryan civilization. There is the view that when in course of time the Vedic culture failed to adapt itself to the changing condition of life and the social environment on account of its rigid conservatism, Tantras which are the rich treasure-house of Sáiva and Sākta philosophy were written and as such they are of recent origin. It may be pointed out here that there is not a single Indian scripture, both Vedic and Non-Vedic, which does not proclaim the glory of the Āgamas. Now regarding the antiquity of the Vedas. it may be pointed out, at the outset, that what is celebrated as the revealed truth (Apauruseya Vākya) in the Vedas is the "Pranava, A-U-Ṃ". In this short and cryptic mantra is represented the quintessence of the Vedic cult. It is composed of two vowel-sounds, A and the U, and one consonant sound Ṃ, Nada and Vindu shown as a crescent with a point over it. These are not to be regarded as unmeaning sounds and alphabets, but they form the divine Trinity representing the mighty surge of eternity, the universal "Rudra-Deva" who is ever manifested in creation, preservation and destruction. Now the Pranava-'Oṃ' was revealed to the Rishis or spiritual visionaries and the 'Rishis'

are so-called because they are the seers of mantras (Risayas mantra drastāras). It will be not be out of place here to raise the question "what was the nature of Sādhana or religious practice by means of which The Rishis or the ancient seers came to visualise the 'Pranava-'Oṃ'. The Vedas do not contain anywhere the nature of such Yogic or religious practices, though they are the encyclopaedia of innumerable theoretical discussions, ethical and religious aphorisms, hymns, rites and rituals, rules of conduct and prohibitions. It is evident that without some sort of Sādhanā or Yogic practice the 'Pranava—'Oṃ' could never be revealed. The instance of such 'Sādhanā' seems to be the conditio-sine-quibos non for the revelation of the Pranava—'OṂ', the substance of all the Vedas. Now it is an admitted and established fact that the Tantras whether Sáiva and Sākta are the rich granaries of Yogic practices on which account they are called 'Sādhana Sāstras'. "It is therefore a great mistake to regard the Tantras as the petty scriptures or Sāstras of particular sect or creed and a still greater blunder to limit its operation to that which is but one only of its particular method of worship or philosophy". Thus for the spiritual revelation, specially of the Vedas, the necessity and antiquity of the Tantras can not be ignored. Further, it is an indubitable fact that all the religious sects of India from time immemorial, have been governed by the Tantras in respect of spiritual initiation or 'mantra-diksha'. The Hindus as a whole comprise within its fold, the Sāktas (Sakti worshippers), the Vaisnavas (worshippers of the God Bishnu), Sáivas (or worshippers of Siva), "Gānapattwas' (or wor-

shippers of the Lord Ganesh) and 'Sauras' (or the worshippers of the Sun God) as well as the Vedāntins. But all these religious sects are spiritually initiated by different mantras (or mystic syllables) which are the exclusive possessions of the tāntrik scriptures. 'Mantra-Dīksha or spiritual initiation by different kinds of mystic syllables is as old as Indian religion itself' and therefore the universality and the antiquity of tantra Sāstras or scriptures cannot be disputed. There are some Vedāntik scholars and philosophers, who in their zeal and enthusiasm lay greater emphasis upon the intellectual and theoretical discussions, have tried to depreciate the Karma-Kānda of the Atharva Veda and the practical scriptures of the Tantras. But the philosophers themselves admit that reality cannot be known by mere speculative thinking and theological discussions, that skill in the arguments and language of the Vedānta does not necessarily lead to real knowledge and emancipation. Further Saktiworship or worship of the primordial power of the universe in the form of the Mother-goddess which is exclusively tāntrik worship has been universally prevalent in India from the very dawn of Indian civilisation and religion. Sakti pithas or sacred places of the universal Mother-deity are to be found in almost all places of India. Benaras is the 'pithasthān' or the sacred abode of the goddess Annapurnā, Kamrūpa in Assam is the pithasthān of the goddess 'Kāmaskhyā', Bengal is the land of of Kālikā, Hingula near Karachi is the land of Kottari, Jālamukhi is the sacred place of the goddess Ambika, Ujjain is the sacred place of the goddess Mahadevi etc. Direct and indirect evidences

may be obtained from the Vedas, the Upanishadas, the Purānas, the Smṛitis, the Mahāvārata and the Rāmāyaṇa in support of the above contention. Shakti or Prakriti is mentioned in the Rig-Veda in her eight different forms. In the Svetāsvataropanishad, 'Maya' has been referred to as 'Prakriti' and Māýin is said to be 'Parameswara' (Māyāṃ tu prakritiṃ vidayam Māyinaṃ tu Maheswaram). In the Taittiriya upanishada, the deity 'Ambikā' is said to be the sister of 'Rudra'. In Jayur-veda, various names of Siva are to be found such as 'Tryambaka', 'Pinākahsata', 'Kṛitibāsa' etc. In the 'Satapatha Brāhmana' we come across the eight names of Siva, such as 'Pashupati' 'Bhaba', 'Mahāndeva' etc. The following remarks of professor Hayman Wilson has great bearing on the antiquity of the Tantras. "It is as idle as it is irrational to dispute the antiquity of the Tantras. The origin, development of the doctrines, traditions and institutions were not the work of a day and testimony which establishes their existence three centuries before Christ carries it back to a much more remote antiquity, to an antiquity that is probably not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions or beliefs of the ancient world". (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1894).

Reputed Vedāntists and Āchāryas like Sankarāchārya, Mādhyāchārya, Vāchaspati Misra have admitted the authenticity and the antiquity of the Tantra. Almost all the Purānas enjoin Tāntrik practices and have referred to the tantras as a source of knowledge. But it is a noteworthy fact that nowhere in the tantras the Purānas are mentioned.

This goes to prove that the Sākta-Āgama or the tantras existed in an age much earlier than the Purānas. Finally unlike the Vedas, the Tantras are the dynamic Sāstras. Tāntrik cult or Sādhanā is not confined to one place and to a particular period in the temporal march of the world order. The revealed knowledge emerging out of Tāntrik practices cannot be exhausted, for verily "Age cannot wither the mighty surge of Eternity, nor custom stale her infinite variety". It has already been pointed out that 'Sakti upāsanā' or worship of the Deity as supreme transcendental conscious Power forms the essence of the Tāntrik cult, and there is no doubt that this cult had a profound influence upon the Vedas. It may be said that the Vedas essentially enjoin Sakti upāsanā or Sakti worship. The Vaidik mantras are meditated upon in certain centres of the autonomous nervous system and the Vaidik Gayatri is there. Now each Vaidik mantra or mystic syllable has a presiding deity who is in Sanskrit called 'Devatā'. In Sanskrit, the word, 'Devatā' is used in the feminine gender, so the relation between a Vaidika mantra and its presiding deity is to be expressed in the feminine. In other words, when the Vaidika deity 'Indra' is meditated upon by the appropriate mantras, it is not the male god who is the object of worship but it is the Áindri-Sakti or the conscious power signified by the term Indra. Similarly when the mantra of 'Rudra' god is meditated upon it is not the Rudra god in the masculine form, but the deity in the feminine form. It has been nicely said in the tantras that it is the Sakti or power of Brahmā who is the real creator, it is the 'Sakti' of Bishnu who is the real maintainer and it is the

Sakti of Rudra who is the real destroyer of the world order.

"Brahmānī kurute Sṛsti, na tu Brahmā Kadāchana,
Vaishnavī kurute Sṭhti na tu Vishnu Kadāchana,
Rudrānī kurute Nāsam, ~~na tu~~ Rudra Kadāchana".
'kubjikā-tantrā.'

The Tantras are the encyclopaedia of Indian Culture and wisdom. Philosophy, art, science, medicine, Astrology, Astronomy, politics, moral science, sociology have been discussed profusely with great insight in the Tantras. In the 'Ṣakti-Mangala Tantra' it is said that the whole of India was divided into three distinct regions according to the classification of the Tantras, and each region was governed by sixty-four tantras. The region from Vindays upto Chittagong formed the Vishnu-Kṛānta or Bengal, from Vindāchala down to Cape Comorin; the whole region was known as Aswakṛanta or modern Deccan, and the region lying between Vindāchala and Nepal-Maha-China was known as Ratha-Kṛānta. So we are led to conclude that as many as 192 tantras governed the whole of Indian Culture and civilisation. It is therefore sheer folly to think that this vast and encyclopaedic literature and cultural heritage which exercised and are still exercising great and profound influence upon the Vedas, the upanisads, the puranas, the 'Samhitas', in short upon what we call Indian civilisation and culture from the straw to the gold, is of recent origin. Want of proper appreciation, actual abuse of its injunction, the impact of Moslem and Western civilisation are responsible for the mass ignorance and negligence of the tāntrik cult which at one time illumined the whole of Indian intellectual

and spiritual horizon. Of course, it is to be considered that there are insurmountable difficulties in bringing out a consistent history of the development of the tāntrik cult from the earliest time down to the present age. In the first place there are special difficulties as regards the records. The fragmentary character of the records and their existence in manuscripts which cannot be easily obtained has been an outstanding obstacle in the way. Secondly, there is the technical character of the tāntrik terminology which can be known only through the help of Guru or spiritual preceptor who is an expert in the line. Thirdly, ritualistic character of the tantra due to the complex and esoteric character of the rituals. And lastly many years of investigation into Indian, Chinese and Tibetan records will have to be made before any final history of the tāntrik cult can be given.

The tantra has various meanings. But the real connotation of the term consists in denoting that encyclopaedic literature and Sādhan Sāstras or the spiritual doctrines and practices which lead to self-realisation as revealed by Shiva and the consort Sakti for the emancipation of the people of Kali-Yuga. The Hindu Sāstras or scriptures have been classified into Shruti, Smriti, Purāna and Tantra. Accordingly there are four such ages or Yugas : 'Satya Yuga' or the Golden Age of righteousness governed by the Srutis, 'Treta Yuga' in which virtue deteriorated by one fourth which was governed by Smriti, the 'Dāpara-Yuga' in which virtue decreased by one half and which was governed by the Purānas and the present 'Kali-Yuga' in which virtue is envelo-

ped by materialism and which is governed by the Tantras. (Kṛite sṛtuḳtamārgaśayat, tretayang sṃriti Sambhavah, dwāpare tu Purānoktaṃ, Kalau āgama kevalam—Kubjikā tantram). So the tantras comprise the specific and appropriate sāstra or scripture of the present age. It is therefore wrong to regard the Tantras as the petty sāstras of any particular sect of Hindu worshippers. It is, on the contrary, a universally applicable sāstra governing all men of the Kali Yuga irrespective of caste, creed or sect.

The Sáiva-Sākta Tantras may be historically classified under three heads, ancient or pre-vedic stretching backwards to pre-historic age, (ii) mediaeval period of creative synthesis during which the process of reciprocal 'taking from and adding to' between the two currents of Indian Culture and civilisation i.e., the vedic cult and the tāntrik cult took place. This was the most fruitful period in the history of the Tantras. Most of the important standard works in the Āgamas and Nigamas, the innumerable treatises based on them and the rich commentaries by subsequent writers are the works of this period. If the Āgamas are to be identified with the Vedas which are the self-revelation of Rudra Deva, as it has been enjoined in the Rig Veda Traiyambkādhya "Eka-eva Rudra na dvitīyothasthe" or as it has been enjoined in the Sukla-Yaur Veda". "Sivāya sivatarāya makarāya sambhabāya cha", then certainly the Āgamas represent the Vedas as well as the Sáiva Āgamas of the mediaeval period. This is evident from the fact that Rudra or Siva who is regarded as the male god is the predominant deity of both the Vedas and the Sáivas. On the contrary, in the

Nigamas, the emphasis is on Sakti Devatā and constitutes the pure Tāntrik order. The amalgamation of the pure Vaidik order, the Sáiva order and the Sākta school of thought was followed by a rich creative synthesis in the mediaeval period which has left for posterity a synthetic religion and philosophy of the East. The modern period may be characterised as commencing from 1200 A.D. pointing towards the dawn of a greater synthetic outlook on life, philosophy and religion of mankind.

It may be mentioned here that Sáiva and Sākta tantras have generally a common philosophical and religious background. They are essentially non-dualistic in spiritual practice and outlook. In some of the Sáiva schools of thought, there are dualistic tenets, no doubt, but their ultimate tendency is towards non-dualism. There is a reference to sixty-four tantras in Sankar's 'Saundarya-Lahari', Joyaratha, in his commentary on Tantrā-loka also refers to this. It is a common belief that sixty-four Bhairava-Āgamas issued from the Jogini face of Siva. They are non-dualistic in character, there are ten Sáiva Āgamas which have a dualistic tendency as well as eighteen Rudra Āgamas which are of a mixed character. There are also other innumerable Āgamas and commentaries most of which are extinct. Their names and existence are known only through indirect evidence, such as frequent references and quotations. 'The Svachhandatantra', 'Mālinī-vijiya tantra', 'the jogini tantra', 'the vijnānā-bhairava', 'Bhairaba tantra', 'Āgamā-rahasya', 'Rudra-Yamala' are some of the outstanding works of the mediaeval age of the Tantras. It may not be out of place here

to mention that though there are differences as regards spiritual practices, philosophical outlook, and theological discussions among the Āgamas, yet all of them reveal a common cultural background and unity of thought in their conception of the unifying principle of Siva and Sakti, of the Saṭ aspect and Ciṭ aspect of ultimate reality. The Sáiva Āgamas as well as tantras declare in unambiguous terms that Siva is the 'Saṭ' aspect and Sakti is the 'Ciṭ' aspect of one and the same ultimate Reality. This non-dualistic approach has brought a revolutionary change in the conception of the Absolute, as self-luminous, self-conscious principle comprehending in its own nature, both the principles of change and changelessness. This synthetic outlook is evident in the Sáiva and Sākta philosophy of the present age, in the writings of Abhinava Guptāchāryya and his followers, in the Sāradatilak-tantra, in the Mahānirvāna tantra, in Prapancasāratantra by Āchārya Sankara. There are, no doubt, two main schools of Sākta culture, namely, the Kāli-kula and the Sree kula schools. Both the schools are almost identical in their conception of the ultimate Reality, though there are marked differences in respect of spiritual practices and customary rites. It is said that Goudapada, was the spiritual preceptor of Govindapadacharya whose direct disciple was Āchārya Abhinava himself. Govindapada wrote a famous commentary called 'Srīvidāya-ratna sutra' on which Sankaracharya has commented. It is to be noted here that Āchārya Samkara's 'Soundarya-Lahari' or Ānanda-Lahari is a master-piece account of Sākta philosophy and Sākta Literature. So is Laksmanadesika's 'Sārada-tilak' with its commentary

by Rāghava Bhattā are authentic works in Sākta philosophy. Somananda's 'Siva-drsti' is a valuable contribution to Sākta philosophy. Abhinava Gupta Acharya's 'Tantra-loka' is a monumental work on Sáiva and Sākta philosophy. His 'Mālini-vijaya-vārtika', 'Pratyabhijna vimīrsini' reveal uncommon scholarship and depth of spiritual insight. The most celebrated names after Abhinava Gupta are, Gorakṣanatha, Punyananda, Sarvānanda, Natanānanda, Amritānanda, Svatantrānanda and Bhāskara Rāya. Purnānanda's 'Kāmakala bilasa' deals with Sakti or primordial power in its creative aspect. Amritānanda was the disciple of Purnānanda. His 'Yoginī-Hṛdaya-Dipika', a commentary on 'Nitya-Ṣoḍasīkārnava of the vāmakesvra tantra is one of the outstanding works on tāntrik culture. Bhāskara Rāya, one of the famous scholars in Sākta school of thought wrote Setu-bhānda. There are also very important works of the Kālikula or Kāli school of thought of which 'Kāla-jñāna', Mahākalā sanhita', 'uttara tantra', 'Sakti Sangama tantra' etc. are outstanding works. In this connection, it will not be out of place to mention that Āchārya Abhinava Gupta who may be regarded as the greatest exponent of Non-dualism in Sáiva-Sākta philosophy was greatly influenced in his conception of the Absolute by the ancient philosophy of grammar. His indebtedness to 'Bhrtṛhari' the celebrated author of the vākya-padītyam is evidently manifest in his frequent quotations from the above work in support of his own views. Bhartṛhari, on the other hand, was greatly influenced by Shaivāgama in identifying his 'para-vak' with the Absolute of Sáiva and Sākta philosophy. The non-dualistic attitude of Sáiva-Sākta philosophy was

not built in a day, it is the result of a long and continuous synthetic process which is the essential character of Indian philosophical speculative thought. The early synthesis of the Aryan and the non-Aryan doctrines and practices has given birth consciously as well as unconsciously to a common set of ideals, customs and traditions which are actively practised and cherished by the major part of the Indian people. These ideals are clearly manifest in the Indian conception of the unity of all life as the expression of one absolute Reality which is both self-conscious and self-luminous, immanent as well as transcendent, a desire for reaching a concerte dynamic synthesis, a faithful adherence to the intellect in tune with a higher plain of mystic vision, a recognition of the miseries and sufferings of life with a view to remove their causes once for all, not only from the life of the individual, not only from the life of the community, but from the life of the whole of humanity, in the recognition of the sacredness of all life which is to be maintained and conserved by the spirit of non-violence, by compassion (Karunā), and by intellectual sympathy (Maitri). This thesis, therefore, is based upon a comparative study of the philosophy of ancient Indian grammar and the six celebrated systems. That they develop by the process of reciprocal 'taking from and adding to' is a common character of the Indian philosophical systems. In this thesis I have not tried to by-pass the trodden path of the ancient Āchāryas. That the non-dualistic outlook of Sáiva-Sākta philosophy has arisen out of a critical reflection on the prevalent systems will be evident from what follows. In this thesis I have tried to show that the Absolute 'Logos', 'Sphota', or 'Parāvāk' of the ancient grammarians,

the 'Parama Siva' of Sáiva Āgama and the self-conscious, self-luminous absolute Power of Sākta Philosophy represent the one absolute ultimate Reality whose experience is this universe of finite minds and finite objects projected externally.

CHAPTER I.

The Metaphysics of 'Class-essence' or Jāti

A merely individual human being like Rāma or Shyāma is inconceivable. A human being as human being is only known through its Universal or class-essence e.g. 'humanity'. It is through its class-essence e.g. 'cowness' that a particular cow is known as a cow as distinguished from all other things. In other words, every individual thing has a pervasive character. It is because the Universal is involved in it that it can be known as a particular thing. These Universals are not mere general concepts abstracted from particular things, but they are objectively real, as they inhere in real objective facts. They are metaphysical entities. These are the various intrinsic powers which manifest individuals. They are like Platonic 'Ideas' or 'Forms' manifested in particular sensible objects or the world of becoming. Now according to ancient Grammarians particular class-essences such as 'manhood' in man, 'cowness' in cows may be brought under a number of higher class-essences till we reach the highest class-essence or 'MAHĀJĀTI' which cannot be brought under any higher class. This 'MAHĀJĀTI' has been called by Helārāja, one of the greatest Commentators of Vākyapadiya, as 'Sattā' or Being. "Sarvvabhāvesu Satrūpam Sāmānyam anugatam". (Vākyapadiya—Commentary by Helārāja). It thus follows that all particular facts and events are but manifestations or objective expressions of a particular universal or class-essence. These particular class-

essences in their turn are expressions of one highest universal known as 'MAHĀJĀTI' or ultimate Being. Now that which is manifested as a particular or individual is continuous with existence or Being. In other words, a manifested thing and the reality of which it is a manifestation are inseparable. In erroneous perception, a rope appears to be a snake and though the knowledge of the snake is quite distinct from the knowledge of the rope, yet the false snake is inalienable from the real rope. Just as a false snake is actual but not ultimately real, similarly all particular things and events and their class-essences being manifested through 'Time-power' are subject to all sorts of mutations and are liable to disappear with the merging of 'Time-power' in absolute Consciousness which is nothing but 'MAHĀJĀTI' or 'Mahāsattā' or ultimate Being. "Sarvvopādhya-vacchinnam Brahmaiva jātiḥ" (Vyākyapadiya-Brhmakānda).

The supporters of Nyayavaiśesika system, however, oppose this view and they hold that we have no knowledge of 'Jāti', or class-essence in Space, Time and Ether. "Kālākāśādisām ekatvāt nityatvena avasthābhedābhāvāt Ca Katham tesu Jātiḥ." They are merely particular substances without parts and we have no knowledge of class-essence inherent in them. But the ancient Grammarians, in reply, say that the Nyāiyāikas themselves admit Samavāya, or the inseparable relation of inherence. Hence they also admit such relation of inherence between 'Avayava' and 'Avayavī' the whole and part of a thing. The part of a chair is its handle, but if we do not admit the distinct existence of the chair and its handle, how can there be any internal relation between the

part and the whole ? For all relations pre-suppose the distinct existence of the relata. The question of relation does not arise at all if the whole and the part are not distinct. In this case, the part of a pot and the pot as a whole must be cognized as distinct. Thus when the Nyaiyāikas admit the inseparable relation of inherence 'Samavāya Sambandha', they are to admit the distinct existence of parts and the whole. But the Nyaiyāikas say that the whole, as it is in itself, has no sensible quality, and because it has no sensible quality, we cannot admit any 'Jāti' or Class-essence as metaphysical entity. Further according to the Nyaiyāikas 'Class-essences' are logical or conceptual, whereas class-essences as conceived by the ancient Grammarians are metaphysical. Grammarians like Bhartṛhari argue that a non-sensible class-essence such as 'cowness' in cows is particularised in individual cows as a particular 'Spatio-temporal' configuration and therefore 'cowness' is the Universal manifested or exemplified or embodied in particular cows. Similarly 'Ākāsa' or Ether, though in itself, is indeterminate and disembodied 'Nirākāra', yet through space and time appear as particularised in different 'Spatio-temporal' configurations, such as 'ghatākāśa', 'mathākāśa' etc. Hence, due to its individuation in particular things like 'ghatākāśa'' 'mathākāśa', we have the cognition of Ether as a 'Jāti' or 'Class-essence' individualised in particular Etherial bodies or regions. In the same way, past, present and future—all are temporal configurations in Eternity. Particular things or persons like 'Panchapāndavās' have disappeared in Time and we have knowledge of the past as an integral part of Time. Similarly, we cognise the

future when we say something will be realised in Time. We say that something exists at the present moment, because that moment is in Eternity. So, we see past, present and future are but concrete particular moments in Universal Time. In this connection, the following aphorism of Bhartṛhari is very much instructive. "Saṃyogī dharmma-bhedena dése Ca parikalpite teṣu deseṣu sāmānyam ākāśasyāpi vidyate (Vākyapadīya, 3 Kāṇḍa, Kārikā 15)"

It has already been pointed out that one Universal 'Mahājāti' is present as ultimate Being or 'Mahā Sattā' permeating the universe of things. All things subsist in existence or Being. Without 'Sattva' or existence nothing can be conceived. "Satyāsatau tu yān bhāvān pratibhāvam vyavasthitau Satyam yat tatra sā jātirasatyāvyaktayaḥ smṛta (Vākyapadīya, Kāṇḍa III, Śloka 32)".

In other words, every individual thing or event is nothing but external manifestation of the supreme universal or 'Mahājāti'. Its individual aspect is nothing but its projection or outward manifestation. Now every individual or particular thing has birth, growth, decay or death, i.e., subject to all kinds of mutations and therefore it cannot have any permanence; but 'Sattā' or Being is not subject to any mutation and remains identically the same through all Time. "Tadeva Nityam yasmin tattvam na Vihannate"—(Pātanjal Mahābhāṣya.)

That alone is eternally true or 'Nitya' which knows no change. As for example, clay remains as one identical thing though its transformations

into pot and other things are subject to change, and are different from one another. Similarly, various kinds of ornaments as particular objects are different from one another in name and form but the class-essence in them i.e., gold remains something permanent and one identical thing. It is evident, therefore, that the class-essence or 'Jāti' knows no change, but particulars are subject to change, and therefore are not ultimately real. Further, ancient Grammarians hold the view that there are innumerable 'Class-essences' e.g., 'manhood' in man, gold in ornaments, animality in animals etc. All these Sub class-essences are projections of five elementary Universal Class-essences. Thus this Universe of things and objective facts are emanations of five elementary class-essences or Universals, like Earth, Water,. Fire, Air and Ether. At the time of dissolution all individual things are dissolved into their Class-essences e.g., men into 'humanity', animals into 'animality', cows into 'cowness', etc. All these Class-essences in their turn are dissolved into five kinds of super class-essences like Earth, Water, Fire, Air and Ether. These primary elementary class-essences, in their turn disappear in one fundamental 'Materia Prima' which is known as 'Mahājāti'. This 'Mahājāti' has been described by ancient Achāryas of Agamaśāstra as 'Parāprakṛti'. "Tatrāpi antyāparāprakrtiḥ satyā sarvvā vikārāṇu yāmenē praśanta kallotā cidekaghana ityāgamavidaḥ Jagataḥ Mahāsattvārūpam". In other words, all ojects and their Universals, are dissolved ultimately into 'Parāprakṛti' or Mahājāti from which they emanate. When all transformations are dissolved in that 'Parāprakṛti' she

remains as Absolute Power or as 'Natura Naturans' in the terminology of Spinoza. "Yatuktam Prithivyadin kim satyam vikalpaḥ vikalpe kim satyam vijnanam vijnane kim satyam atha tat Brahma". Now, the term 'Vikalpa' signifies that which does not exist yet appears as an object of knowledge through 'Śabda' or 'Logos'. As for example, the rope is not a snake, yet 'there is a snake' or 'I see a snake there' such knowledge arises. Thus serpent as an object of knowledge arises through words expressed in a string of sounds though there is no real snake. We are in the habit of abusing a person as the son of a barren woman. In fact there is no son of a barren woman, yet the expression 'son of a barren woman' appears as an object of knowledge in imagination. This is known as 'Vikalpa-jnanam', experience which is acquired through sounds without reference to any objective fact or thing. "Sabdajnānānupātī Vastusūnyaḥ Vikalpaḥ". Here the grammarians say if there be no meaning in the expression 'son of a barren woman' such expression cannot be grammatically expressed with adjuncts and as parts of speech "Arthavadadhāturapratyayah prātipadikam" (Vyākapadiya). But we do use the expression 'Look here, there goes the son of a barren woman' with a chaplet of sky-flower. "Ayam bandhāsuto yāti khapuspa krta shekhara". When such expressions are used grammatically as parts of speech, though 'son of a barren woman' has no existence in fact, yet it exists as an object of imaginative thought. Thus the expression 'son of a barren woman' may not correspond to fact, but it exists as an object of experience expressed through sounds. Objective facts or existants or

particular things and events are merely temporal manifestations of 'Mahāsattā' or ultimate Being in 'spatio-temporal' individuations. Now class-essences or universals like 'manhood' in man, 'animality' in animals are not apprehended by the senses, and therefore they are super-sensuous. In the words of plato they are apprehended by 'reason' alone.

It has already been pointed out that every particular thing has a pervasive character. It is the outward manifestation of its Universial or class-essence which is cognised as supersensuous. Such universals have substantive reality or being, because their being is derived from ultimate reality as Pure Being or 'Mahā-Sattā'. Now the word, 'man', implies an individual being which is after all nothing but a 'model' being as well as an uttered string of sounds which manifest him as an individual object. Similarly 'humanity' in man, 'animality' in animals etc. which are cognised as class-essences or universals are expressed through a string of sounds. A particular thing is apprehended through particular string of sounds. Similarly, the words ,'humanity' or 'animality' reveal class-essences or universals cognised through string of sounds. These universals cognised through sounds in their turn are manifestations of one absolute Reality which is known as 'Śabda' or 'Logos'. This shows that this universe of objective facts expressed through letters, words and sounds is nothing but projections of Śabda or 'Logos'.

The question that arises here is, whether Jāti or Class-essence can be cognised in 'Śabda'. Particular things and events are physical existants

and each of these appear as whole of many parts. All these parts inhere in the whole, as the part of an earthen pot inheres in the pot. If the parts of a pot do not exist, the pot cannot come into existence. In such cases, without particular parts there is no whole. In other words without particulars there can be no Universal. Thus without individuals, class-essences or universals like 'humanity' 'animality' etc. are inconceivable. As qualities which are disembodied inhere in objects, so do class-essences in particular objects. "Jāti kvacit āśrīyate nira-vayavatvāt yathā-guṇaḥ".

But the moot point is—as 'Śabda' is disembodied, how can there be an inseparable relation of inherence between it and the embodied particulars? As for example, the word 'pot' exhibits a string of sounds. As a string of particular sounds it reveals three distinct sounds audible to the ear, the sound 'P', the sound 'O' the sound 'TA-, so the word 'pot' as a string of sounds is a unity manifested through three distinct sounds. Every sound which is audible to the ear or apprehended by the sense of hearing is a temporal event as it is expressed through time and audible in time and as such it dies out in time. Now when the last sound 'T' is uttered, preceding sounds expressed through the letters like 'P', 'O' no longer exist. As there is a succession of sounds, so the string of sounds, viz. 'pot' which is expressed through the word 'pot' cannot be called their Universal as there is no real 'unity', because preceding sounds no longer exist. Therefore the conception of class-essence or Jāti in sounds is absurd. This is the view of 'Nyāya'

and Vaiśeṣika systems, but their arguments can be met on their own grounds, specially when we find them holding a similar view in respect of their doctrine of action or Karma. The supporters of 'Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika' system hold the view that every action is a transition, a momentary change. 'Tritiyakshaṇadhvansapratiyogi'. Strangely enough they contradict their own view in holding that particular action though transitory, such as going, throwing, singing etc. yet their particular manifestations in 'Spatio-temporal' relations signify their universal which is activity in general. Similarly, audible sounds or words may be transitory, yet their Universals are admissible. "Tatra asatyāpi Śabda-vyaktisamavāye kramagṛhītavarṇaja saṃskāra saṃkṛte antaḥkaraṇe Carama varṇs vijnātah sā gṛhyate". It is therefore a pointless argument against the Sabdabrahmavādins.

Further, it may be pointed out that though the preceding sounds no longer remain audible and disappear, they leave sound-impressions in the mind and all the impressions of the preceding and succeeding sounds combine together to form a string of sounds expressed through the sound 'Pot'. This string of sounds as manifested in particular sounds is nothing but the Universal implied in them. Further, the Absolute reality which is regarded here as 'Parāvāk' unfolds itself in and through an infinite variety of words and sounds. In other words, it is the 'Word' of all words, the 'logos'. All particular sounds are projections or 'spatio-temporal' events which evolve out of this Absolute primordial 'Logos'. Now all particulars happen

in time and therefore they are subject to change and mutation like birth, growth, decay, but their universals changelessly endure. Particulars are resolved into their Universals; universals again are resolved into one absolute 'Mahāsattā' which is described by the great sage Kaiyat in his commentary on 'Mahābhāṣya'. "Sarvvopādhyavacchinnam Brahmaiva jātih". The Chhāndogya upanishad says 'Sat eva idam agre āsīt, ekam eva advitīyam' (6,2,1). Being only was 'This' in the beginning, One only without a second. This Being is 'Esse Absolutum, simpliciter nullo addito', Being through and through and nothing other than Being. This 'Mahāsattā' has been worshipped in Chandi as 'Jāti'.

Moreover, the ancient advocates of the theory of Universals or class-essences hold the view that all particular objects coming under a class-essence which is its Universal are manifestations of that Universal. Similarly, every audible word (Baikhari Sabda) is the manifestation of its Universal which is Parā Vāk or primordial 'logos'. When several persons like Rāma, Shyāma, Jadu, Hari etc. utter the word 'cow', we cognise in all these particular words their Universal or class-essence signified by the Śabda 'cow'. In the same way, the uttered sounds 'cow', 'cow' etc. are expressions of one Universal 'Sabda'—'cow'. Thus in the first place particular objects and their Universals or class-essences are inseparably related by way of inherence. In the second place class-essences which are metaphysical like 'humanity' in men and the sound 'humanity' are intrinsically related and are appre-

hended by the understanding as forming a whole, 'gestalt' in modern terms. Some opponents of this view hold that Universals manifested in particular words and Universals or class-essences in particular objects cannot be inseparably related. We are in the habit of uttering such words as 'sky-flowers' which have no correspondence in fact. These are words without any objective 'counterpart'. If that be so, how can there be an inseparable relation of inherence between Universals implied in particular objects and Universals intrinsic in particular sounds? In answer to such objection, ancient Grammarians like Sri Bhartṭhari holds that although words like 'sky-flowers' do not correspond to any external object, yet they create a mental image which appear as an object of imaginative experience. Whenever we hear some uttered word, there occurs in the mind some sort of mental configuration or 'Vṛtti', this mental configuration projects itself as out there in the objective order of things and that is what is known as 'Vikalpajanām'. If these words do not signify even any mental configuration 'Antarasattā', or 'Vṛtti' then such words as 'sky-flowers' having neither any mental configuration nor objective existence become absolutely meaningless. But Maharṣi Pāṇini holds the view that such meaningless jargons of sounds can neither be used as parts of speech nor as objects of knowledge and belief and be significantly employed as parts of speech with necessary grammatical adjuncts.

According to the view of the Nyaiyāikas, the relation between word and an objective fact is external; for they belong to different 'Spatio-tempo-

ral' configurations. Hence, they cannot be regarded as forming a whole. Sounds or words happen in Ether and things exist on earth. Here the ancient Grammarian Philosophers rejoin that both sounds and particular things expressed through words have either their being in absolute consciousness or 'Chit' or are to be regarded as facts of Absolute Consciousness. They emerge out of the same absolute Consciousness and both are its external projections. It is to be noted here that according to ancient grammarians, 'Parāvāk' or the Logos which is pure consciousness is the ultimate Reality which manifests the world of objective facts on the one hand and the appropriate strings of sounds on the other. In other words, the universe of external objects is the dream-like projection of pure Consciousness. According to them, all uttered sounds or Baikhari Śabda projected in the etherial region are manifestations of 'Sphota' and all particular things are externalisation or expressions of 'Sphota' or pure Consciousness which is the 'Parāvak' or Primordial Logos.

This Universe teeming with particular objects and sounds is the outward projection through Time and Space of one ultimate Reality which the ancient grammarians call 'Sphota'. 'Sphota' is the primordial Logos of all sounds uttered or unexpressed, as well as of Universals or class-essences either in the form of sounds and class-essences in the form of so called phenomenal entities. We may come acrcss with an object which we had never seen or known before, but so long as we are not acquainted with the sound which manifests the object, we can have

no knowledge of that object. In order to know the 'what' of the object, we usually ask other persons through uttered words indeed, 'what is that thing'?, and the answer is given through so many strings of sounds which furnish the understanding with an acquaintance of the object. Thus, we may have acquaintance of an object through the eyes, but so long as we do not hear its name through sounds and words we have no complete knowledge of it. In other words, every object is known through the string of sounds which manifests not only its meaning but also its essence. An object is but an expression of sounds which presents the object to the understanding or Reason. Thus, knowledge of sounds, letters, words etc. uttered or unexpressed is necessarily postulated in our knowledge of objective facts.

In the second place, audible words or 'Baikhari' śabda, first of all, manifests Universals or class-essences which are projected out there as particular things. As for example, if the proposition 'bring the cow' indicates the knowledge only of an individual cow then individuals being innumerable, such a proposition will mean knowledge of innumerable cows, which is absurd. Thus a word connotes, first of all, a Universal or class-essence and when we bring any individual cow in response to such a proposition as 'bring the cow', assertions like these become valid and fruitful. The uttered word 'cow' does not merely signify any individual cow but first of all manifests a Universal or class-essence such as 'Cowness'. This class-essence as an existential fact immanent in particular cows is the outward manifestation of the sound 'Cow'. Thus,

knowledge of Universals expressed through sounds is the conditio sine quibus non of knowledge of class-essences immanent in particular objects and between Universals expressed through sounds and class-essences manifested in particular things—there is an internal integrate relation. Just as expansion can never be alienated from heat, similarly these two kinds of Universals can never be separated from each other. It has already been shown, by way of example, that a rope itself and no other object appears to be a snake. In the same way, Universals in sounds are externalised in class-essences which manifest particular things and objects. As there is no dualism between a certain Universal and its particulars, there can be no real dualism between sounds and their Universals intrinsically immanent in them.

What the ancient Grammarians want to emphasise is that the world of objective facts is the outward projection of pure Consciousness. There is apparent duality between the two, but there is no absolute dualism. All particulars, whether objects and sounds and their class-essences or Jāti emerge out of pure Consciousness and this being so, both of them are manifestations of consciousness arising out of universal consciousness itself. Thus, reality or Being and Sounds and their universals arise out of the same root and manifest a whole. This is known as 'Sāmānādhikaraṇya' in the technical language of ancient Grammar, which means the intrisic relation of a substrate with its substratum. Therefore, there is no reason to suppose that Śabda does not manifest 'Artha' or object. Śabda as

consciousness or 'sphota' is the 'Vāchaka', or the 'Referendum' or self-revealing objective Reality in relation to the 'Reference' which is called 'Vāchya'.

Thus universals as configurations of Consciousness arise first out of universal Absolute 'Sphota' or Śabda-Brahma and then these configurations of Consciousness which form a unity of sounds and which make the mighty frame of the universe manifest this outward world. Cognition of an object is made through words or sounds which constitute its 'JATI' or universal. As the super-imposed snake and the rope upon which the super-imposition is made appear as integrated with the snake, class-essence involved in particular sounds manifests class-essence involved in particular objects. This kind of super-imposition which manifests identity is technically called 'Tādātmyādhāsa', or two appearing as integrated with one another, as reflection and the object reflected reveal an identity through duality. The conclusion that can be drawn here is that 'Sphota' which is the 'Pure Light of Absolute Consciousness' projects itself into a world of objective facts thus revealing its own identity as well as in the act of self-projection is manifested in the multiplicity of things.

CHAPTER II.

A Critical estimate of some of the objections against the doctrine of 'Sphota'.

The moot point which is under discussion here is "how are we to know that Śabda as 'Sphoṭa' is real eternal and immutable?" The advocates of Nyaya-Vaiseṣika system and Bhatta-Mimāṅsakas do not admit the reality of Sphota. A careful examination of the whole controversy is necessary for the establishment of the doctrine of 'Sphota' as advocated by ancient Grammarians and Sáiva Philosophy.

It has been held that Śabda as 'Universal' or Jāti is expressed through letters which are its constitutive elements. If that be admitted, if every letter of a word manifests the class-essence then succeeding letters are superfluous. For example, if we utter the word 'cow', and if the word 'cow' is fully manifested by the consonant 'C', then the vowel 'O' and the consonant 'W' become meaningless and the sounds produced by their successive utterances become absolutely unnecessary. It is evident that letters by themselves do not convey the meaning of words. Further, it may be held that particular letters or alphabets may not constitute the meaning of the 'universal' or class-essence involved in words, but their combinations do. This view is also wrong. For when the second letter of a word is uttered, the utterance as well the sound of the preceding letter no longer remain; as utterance implies activity, and all forms of activities die out

in the third moment. 'Tṛtīya Kṣaṇadhvansapratiyogitva'. The time-point through which the first letter of a word finds expression does not manifest the following letter and disappears in eternity when the succeeding letters find expression in another time-point or temporal configuration. As all the letters cannot be uttered at a time, it is absurd to think that combination of letters manifests 'Universal' in words. The upholders of the view that letters manifest 'universals' in words here change their front and say that though each letter, in a word, does not manifest fully the meaning or universal in uttered words, yet every uttered letter leaves an 'impress' in the mind and thereby manifests to a certain extent, though vaguely, its universal. Just as when a poem is read for the first time, its full import may not be comprehended by the understanding at once, but by repeated effort its full import is assimilated. Similarly the full import of a word like 'cow' is realised in and through successive utterances of the letters 'C', 'O' and 'W'. In other words, the full meaning or universal implied in words gradually unfolds itself in and through letters composing it. "Yathā Ca ślokaḥ sakṛt paṭhyamāno nāvadhāryate abhyāsena tu sphuṭāvabhāsaḥ tathā Caramatvena vicakāsti ratnatattvavat Sphoṭatattvam, prathamākṣareṇa hi jāterābhāsamātram jnanyate, taduttarottaravarṇakalāpena tu sphuṭatara Sphuṭana-paricched-ādhānam". Such a rejoinder cannot however be accepted, for the universally accepted view is that words alone are expressive of 'meanings' and not letters. "Sabdāt Artham Pratipadyāmahey".

The aforesaid controversy between the Nyaya-Vaiseṣikas and the ancient Grammarians boils down to this fundamental issue viz. "what does 'Sabda' imply"? According to ancient Grammarians, Śabda is indeterminate and therefore it has no parts. The meaning of the word "water' is neither implicit in its letters nor can be apprehended by the letters composing it. The word 'water' signifies an indivisible unity of alphabets and thus it is capable of expressing its meaning. If it be said that Śabda is a disembodied reality as well as indeterminate, but the various sounds produced by uttering the letters constitute its parts or its various limbs, then it must be admitted that similar sounds produced by other alphabets in any other language cannot be parts of the sound produced by uttering the word 'cow'. But it cannot be denied that sounds produced by uttering the letters 'C' and 'O' can also be expressed by letters in other languages. This shows that sounds produced by the letters 'C' and 'O' are neither parts of the word 'cow' nor parts of the sound produced by uttering the word 'cow'. There are innumerable kinds of letters in various languages and all these letters are used to give expression to uttered sounds. A particular uttered word may be composed of different kinds of letters from different languages, but the sound expressed by that word is the same to all kinds of listeners. The word 'Rāma', may be expressed through various kinds of letters but the Śabda or sound which manifests the word 'Rāma' is one and indivisible for all persons. "Sā jātiḥ prathamam Sabda hi sarvvairevābhidhiyatē tato'rthajātirūpeṣu tadadhyāropakalpanā". (Vākyapadiya)

Further, it is an admitted fact that different words in different languages can manifest the same object or 'meaning'. e.g., 'water' in English, 'āpah' in Sanskrit, 'Pāni' in Hindi etc. go to show that words convey 'meaning' and not letters. In order to apprehend 'meaning' in words by the exercise of the intuitive faculty men have discovered so many letters. Thus letters are ever-changing, admit of varieties and are subject to mutations, but words are immutable and inevitably manifest their 'meaning'. Moreover, the same sound may be expressed by various words in different languages. That which manifests words reveals at the same time their 'meanings' and not letters. Helārāja, the celebrated commentator, on the above aphorism, has pointed out that a particular sound which finds objective expression in and through the word 'man' is responsible for manifesting the 'universal' or meaning implicit in it, and then this expressed through sounds manifests the immanent class-essence of a particular class of objects. It is evident that letters happening in close succession do not convey any meaning. Each letter as soon as it is uttered is no doubt dissolved into eternity in the third moment. Therefore sound expressed by word is not composed of particular sounds expressed by the letters of the word. Arrangement of letters in succession is only a construction of the understanding.

Kumarila Bhatta and other Mimāmsakas do not admit the reality of 'Śphota' underlying and beyond letters. They hold the view that Śabda is nothing beyond the dynamic flux of sounds arising out of

uttered letters in a word. As 'Sphota' is not audible to the ear, it cannot be called sound which expresses a particular word. "Tasmāt śrotra paricchinna yadyarthaṃ gamyennavā sarvvathā tasya śabdatvaṃ lokasiddhaṃ na hīyate". In other words, an audible sound is Śabda, whether it conveys a 'meaning' or not. Therefore, it is not 'Sphota' which manifests 'meaning' of a word, but the letters composing a word convey its 'meaning'. In reply to this, the author of the Mahābhāsya, has given a definitive answer in the following lines. "Yena uccāritena sāsnā-lāṅgula-kukudakhura viṣāṇiñam sampratyayo bhavati sa śabdaḥ". (Mahabhaṣya). The ultimate cause of all manifestations is Śabda or 'Sphota', and it is the manifesting principle of all objects or meanings implied in words. It is because 'meaning' as an objective fact finds expression through Śabda or 'Logos' that Sabda has been called 'Sphota'. "Sphutati arthoyasmat iti Sphotaḥ." If we utter different letters, different sounds are produced and there is a succession of sounds like points in a line. When the first letter of a word is uttered, its sound disappears after an interval. Letters which do not find expression in and through appropriate sounds are absurd. Therefore, it is absurd to think that combination of audible letters is possible, and if it be not possible 'how can it manifest any object?' Secondly if a mere combination of letters conveys 'meaning' in words, then the uttered words 'God' and 'Dog' both of which are composed of the same letters will mean the same object. But this is absurd. Further, the Mīmāṅsakas themselves admit that when a perceptible cause cannot be obtained to explain an effect, then an

imperceptible cause may be admitted in explaining the meaning of words. We do find that combination of letters differently arranged conveys separate meanings implied in words. It has been stated in Śābarabhāsya. "Akṣareṣu nimittabhāvaḥ, sadbhāve bhāvāt tadbhāve cābhāvāt". Letters convey 'meaning', their absence do not convey anything. Further, it has been pointed out by the Mīmāṅsakas that in common parlance as soon as the last letter in a word is uttered, the meaning of the word is understood. When we utter the consonant 'C', we do not understand the significance of the word 'cow', but the very moment the last letter is uttered, that is 'W', we come to realise what the word conveys. Therefore it may be said that 'meaning' of a word is manifested by the last letter composing it. In reply to this, it may be pointed out that the view that the utterance of the consonant 'W' suggests the 'meaning' of the word 'cow' is absurd. To this the Mīmāṅsakas rejoin that prior letters like 'C' and 'O' help the last letter 'W' to form a combination, and thus without these letters no meaning can be manifested. Now it is a fact that without sound, uttered or unexpressed there is no manifestation of letters. In other words, sounds manifest letters. When the letter 'C' in the word 'cow' is uttered, the sound of the letter 'C' does not persist and with the disappearance of its sound it also disappears. Therefore, 'how can there be a combination between a non-existant letter and an uttered letter ?' Thus neither combination of letters nor combination of their respective sounds manifest the 'meaning' of a word.

Lastly the Mīmāṅsakas contend that uttered letters in a word produce impressions in the mind. These impressions combine with the last letter of a word and thereby manifest its meaning. As for example, if anybody wants to go to Banaras on foot, the last step which he takes in reaching Banaras may be said to be the immediate cause of his arrival at Banaras. But that is not a fact. Every step he takes has its own effect and all the effects of separate steps combine together to produce the desired effect, namely arrival at Banaras, though antecedent steps no longer exist when succeeding steps are taken. From this, it is evident that many transitory activities produce a lasting impression through which the desired effect is obtained. "Ekasādhanasaṃsthāśca vyāpārāvayavā yadā svarūpato nirūpyante yaugapadyamasatyadā kiṃ punarbahavo bhinnābhinna-sādhana-saṃsthitā bhaveyuryogapadyena vyāpārākrama varthinaḥ" (Tantravv̄rtika). Hence the Mīmāṅsakas conclude. "Pūrvvapūrvva-varṇa-janitasaṃskārasahito'ntavarṇa vācakaḥ". Impressions or Sanskārās produced by antecedent letters combine with the last letter of a word and manifest its meaning. From all these it is evident that the impressions created by antecedent letters are in the region of memory, and therefore recalled letters combining with uttered letters express the full significance or import of a word. But there is no evidence of such association of memory and perception producing a single effect. Therefore the legitimate conclusion that the Mīmāṇsakas can possibly arrive at is that the impressions or images produced by antecedent letters and impressions produced by the last letter of a word together

manifest its meaning. But the above conclusion, the ancient grammarians contend, is fallacious and pointless. For every impression created by the sound of uttered letter refers to that letter only and not to any other letter. As for example, image of a cow refers to a particular animal and not to any other animal. It follows that impression of a particular letter brings back to memory only that particular letter and not any other thing such as the 'meaning' of a word. Thus impressions of letters cannot convey any meaning of words. "Yadjātīyaḥ samutpādyaḥ tajjātīyasya kāraṇaṃ svayaṃ yaḥ tadvijātiyaḥ saṃskāraḥ saguṇo bhavet nahi jātu gavāvagraha-pratyayaprabhāvitaḥ samskāro ásvasmraṇam upakalpayati (Tārkikarakṣa-Varadarāja)".

In the fourth place, the Mīmāṅsakas change their position and say that every effect has its cause, so when the meaning of a word is manifested or assimilated, it must have its own cause, and a perceptible effect should not be explained by any imperceptible cause. Impressions created by successive letters in a word produce two kinds of effects. In the first place, they bring to memory preceding letters which have already been uttered and they reveal the meaning implied in words. If combination of sound-impressions of letters composing a word does not manifest its meaning, then it will be tantamount to saying that 'meaning' or objects implied in words are never manifested, and in that case, words without significance or meaning will be figments of imagination. By way of illustration they point out that if it be said that Devadutta is a

fatty man and if it be said that he does not eat anything in the day, yet as without taking of food, no fat can be generated in the body, we are led to postulate that he definitely takes food at night; similarly, combination of impressions or images produced by different sounds of letters when uttered not only enable us to recall the letters themselves but also manifest 'meaning' in words. "Yadyapi smṛti-hetutvaṃ saṃskārasya vyavasthitaṃ kāryāntare'pi sāmarthyaṃ na tasya pratisidhyate (Tanrtavārttika)". In reply to this argument of the Mīmāṅsakas, the ancient grammarians point out that here it is necessary to explain what we mean by 'Saṅskāra' or impression. In the language of ancient Grammarians like Panini 'Saṅskāra' is the agency through which objects experienced in the past are recalled. There can be no two opinions regarding this definition, and if this definition be accepted then the power to manifest meaning is superimposed upon the power which is known as 'Saṅskāra' or the power of recalling and recognising past experience. But such postulation of an ad hoc power exposes us to the fallacy of infinite regress. For this ad hoc power of manifesting meanings in words will require another power and that again will require another power and so on 'ad infinitum'.

Further, if arrangement of letters in a word is reversed, then in spite of different 'Saṅskāras' produced by different letters, we assimilate differences in meanings. As for example the words 'God', and 'Dog', 'Stars' and 'Rats' are composed of the same letters and they produce same impressions or 'Saṅskāras' in the mind, but due to different

arrangement of letters in the above words, different 'meanings' or objects are manifested. Therefore, it follows that combination of 'Saṅskāras' produced by letters in words can never be the cause of manifesting their meaning.

Moreover, the Mīmāṅsakas who oppose the doctrine of 'Sphota' hold the view that sound-images produced by sounds of letters combine together and enable us to form a whole or single memory-image composed of many parts. These sound-images are also capable of producing other effects. As for example, performance of religious sacrifices and other rites create certain 'Saṅskāras' and they are conserved as merits which become ultimately the efficient cause for the attainment of higher status like redemption or freedom from bondage. Similarly, combination of letters in a word produces simple and single sound-image and that is the cause of manifesting meaning in words. Thus, the Mīmānsakas hold the view that such a single sound-image is the revealer of meaning in words. Though such simple sound-image comes in between combination of letters and meaning in words, yet there is no reason to deny that they reveal meaning or objects implied in words. As for example, the efficiency of a cause is not hampered in any way though some kind of activity intervenes between the cause and the effect. Similarly, such sound-images may intervene between combination of letters and meaning in words, yet there can be nothing to deny that combination of letters manifest meaning in words. "Svavyāpāra vyavāyo'pi sarvvasminneva kārake dṛstovyāpāra idṛk ca śabdasyetyavyayetatā"-

Tantravartika". In reply to this, the ancient Grammarians say that though the Mīmānsakas deny 'Sphota' as an extramundane reality, yet they assert the reality of Saṅskāra which they hold as something imperceptible and extra-mundane. If any extra-mundane cause be admitted like the 'Saṅskāras', what prevents us from admitting 'Sphota'? But Mīmāṅsakas contend that the ancient Grammarians admit the simple sound-image caused by sounds of different letters in words along with 'Sphota' i.e., the potential subtle power immanent in words which manifest their meaning. When there is unanimity among the Mīmāṅsakas and ancient Grammarians as to the existence of sound-images, the law of parsimony demands that the postulation of a hypothetical entity like 'Sphota' must be given up. Therefore, there is no necessity in assuming 'Sphota' as the manifesting principle of meaning in words. "Sadbhāva-vyatirekaṇ ca tathāvayava-varjjanam tavādhikaṃ bhavet tasmāt yatno' savarthabudhiṣu (Tantra-varttika)". Such transcendental noumenal 'Sphota' beyond and behind letters or combination of letters is nothing but a product of imagination. Further 'Sphota' is disembodied and indeterminate and therefore cannot be expressed through letters, as such, an extra sensible reality like 'Sphota' should be assumed. Here the ancient Grammarians retort and say that sound-images which on the admission of the Mīmāṅsakas are subtle are not only not objective realities but also something illusory in that they are quite different from impresstion left by sounds in letters. The Mīmāṅsakas admit that merits accrued from the performance of religious rites are no

doubt 'Saṅskāras', but such 'Saṅskāras' are quite different from 'Saṅskāras' which rouse up memory. So 'Saṅskāra' created by sounds in letters is a mysterious something which manifests meaning in words. Ancient Grammarians admit the reality of 'Saṅskāra' or sound-image which generates memory, but they are not the manifesting principle of meaning in words. For differences in effects are due to differences in causes. In this connection two separate effects are apparent, one memory-image and the other apprehension of meaning. Memory-image is aroused by 'Saṅskāra' and meaning is apprehended by 'Sphota' or the manifesting principle in words. If 'Saṅskāras' themselves could constitute the manifesting principle of meaning in words, then a single 'Saṅskāra' would reveal the meaning in words which is absurd. But due to the differences in place, time and activities, different 'Saṅskāras' accrue to the various performers. But the question under reference is, 'how can different 'Saṅskāras' arising out of different activities manifest meaning in words?' It is the indeterminate Sound or 'Sphota' or 'Logos' which alone can manifest meaning in words. Therefore, there should not be any need of assuming such sound-images caused by a conglomeration of sounds in letters. Even the Mīmāṅsakas who are known as varnavadins as advocating the doctrine that combination of letters in a word reveals its meanings, cannot deny that different sounds manifest different letters. Ancient Grammarians also admit such conglomeration of sounds which arise out of a primordial indeterminate 'Logos' known as 'Sphota'. Moreover, ancient Grammarians never say that 'Sphota' is imperceptible, but they hold the view

that 'Sphota' or the manifesting principle of meaning in words is apprehended through inward perception or intuitive insight which is, of course, quite different from ordinary visual perception of particulars. In other words, realisation of 'Sphota' means bringing into the focus of self-consciousness meanings implied in words. "Na so'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamāt ṛte anuviddhamiva jñānam artham śabdena bhāṣate (Vākyapadīya)".

In this connection, ancient Grammarians clinch their arguments by pointing out that 'Saṅskāras' can never be the objects of perception, nor can they be inferred from perceptible objects. For we infer the cause by observing its effect and the cause is immediate antecedent to the effect. Words immediately reveal their meaning, but 'Saṅskāras' or memory-images are effects of words. How can effects of words which are memory-images be the efficient cause of manifesting meaning in words? Memory-image and objects are co-effects of words and just as day and night are co-effects of one and the same cause, co-effects can never be related as cause and effect. Moreover, it may be asked 'what is the differentiating principle which distinguishes one memory-image from another memory-image'? If it be said that the different letters tend to produce different memory-images, then the same letters which constitute 'dog' and 'God' will produce the same meaning both in their regular and reverse orders. For both the words are composed of the same letters. If it be said it is the arrangement of letters that is responsible for producing differnt memory-images, then the Mīmāṅsakas themselves will have to admit

that letters do not produce memory-images, and thus they will be involved in self-contradiction. It is, therefore, evident that if the word 'cow' does not reveal its meaning or object, and if the word 'horse' does not reveal any real horse, then any word would reveal any object, any single word would reveal all objects both of which are equally absurd. Therefore it follows that the relation between a word or 'pada' and object or 'padārtha' is the relation of revealer and the revealed. The pre-supposition of all knowledge is the knowledge of the relation between the revealer and the revealed and there is no place of memory-image here. Further, the cause must be unconditional antecedent, and by unconditional antecedent we mean that antecedent which not only invariably precedes the effect but which is also self-sufficient by itself to produce the effect without the help of any other condition. But memory-images are neither self-sufficient nor self-existent realities. Therefore, they cannot be the manifesting principle of meanings in words. Thus, it follows that uttered words manifest 'Sphota' which in turn manifests the phenomenal world of objective facts. A single uttered word like 'cow' and an object like 'cow' are inseparably connected.

Before we conclude, it is, however, of fundamental importance to show that some 'Sūtras' or aphorisms of Jaimini, can be interpreted in support of the reality of 'Sphota'. Such an attempt may settle once for all the long-drawn controversy between Mīmāṅsa and the conclusions reached by ancient Grammarians. Jaimini's sūtras or aphorisms understood and interpreted correctly in their

true context do not, in our opinion, contradict views of Pātanjali and other celebrated Grammarians. If we look deeper into the aphorisms of Jaimini, we will find that the intention of Jaimini in the following sūtras is a clear enough pointer to the reality of 'Sphota'. That the controversy between the Mīmāṅsa philosophy and the philosophy of the ancient Grammarians is the creation of later commentators will be evident from what follows.

Maharsi Jaimini undoubtedly made a distinction between audible sound and 'Logos' or 'Śabda' as 'Apauruṣeya vākya' or subtle sound as Absolute Reality. So most of his sūtras have reference only to sounds and not to Śabda. According to him 'Dhvani' or sound finds expression through physical and physiological activity and therefore it is fleeting :

"Kaŕmaike Tattra Darsanāt"

When a sound is made, it does not persist 'Asthanāt' 1/1/7.

We are in the habit of saying 'he is making a sound' or 'I am hearing a sound'. In other words, 'dhvani' or sound is due to some activity and that is why it must be fleeting.

"KAROTI ŚABDĀT" (1/1/8)

Sattāutary cha jougapaddāt 1/1/9.

As an audible sound can be heard simultaneously by many persons, it occupies different positions in space and therefore it is fleeting. Sound admits of degree in massiveness or volume and intensity, hence it is fleeting :

"Briddhischa Kartibhūmnāsya" 1/1/11

That the above sūtras are applicable only to audible sound and not to Śabda or 'Sphota' which is beyond all mutations will be apparent from the following sūtras :—

"SATAḤ PARAMADARŚANANG BISHĀN-ĀGAMĀT" (1/1/13)

It has already been said that an uttered word does not persist in existence and therefore it is fleeting. But what the above sūtra implies is that though there may not be any inseparable relation between one who utters a sound and the sound itself, yet the knowledge obtained from such sound persists uniformly. This shows that though 'Śabda' after being expressed through sound may not be audible, yet it cannot be said to be fleeting. As in the absence of light, hills and trees remain invisible, but their existence is in no way affected. It is evident that what Maharsi Jaimini wanted to imply is that though Eternal Sound unfolds itself in and through audible sounds, yet in the absence of perceptible sounds Eternal Sound is in no way affected. Therefore, the above sūtra is consistent with the doctrine of 'Sphota' and is not opposed to it. Further, the sūtra "PROYOGASYA PARAM" has reference to pronunciation of sound and not to its production. In other woids, when we say that some person is making a sound, we do not mean that he is producing sound, what we mean is that he is giving expression to what cannot be pronounced by audible sounds, he is determining what is indeterminate. The above sūtra has reference to uttered

sound or audible sound and not to Eternal 'Logos'. Further, the sūtra "ADITYAVAT YOUGAPADYAM" (1/1/15) implies that just as one and the same Sun is simultaneously visible to innumerable persons, and just as its reflections are innumerable, yet its oneness remains unaffected; similarly, Eternal 'Logos' though manifested in and through innumerable audible sounds, yet its oneness or identity remains the same. 'Logos' is one 'Absolute', though it is manifested in and through finite centres. The great sage Patanjali in his Mahābhāsya says "ĀDITYAVAT SUH" which has the same meaning as in Jaimini's above sūtra. Acharya Bhartṛhari in his famous book Vākyapadiya says : "Prativimbam Yathānyatra Sthitam Toyakriyavasat Tatpravrittimivatbeti Sa Dharmaḥ Sphotanadayoḥ" (1/49). In other words, as reflections are many on account of the action of being reflected and due to the variety of mediums through which reflections are manifested, similarly one and the same 'Sphota' or 'Logos' due to its intrinsic power of self-projection finds expression in and through different points of space and instants of time in the form of innumerable audible sounds. This view is supported by the Jaimini Sūtras 'Barnāntaramabikara' 1/1/16. This Śabda which is Eternal remains unaffected, though sounds arising out of it change according to differences in alphabets, and their pronunciations. Letters in a word may be subject to changes and thus may pass through modifications, but 'Logos' or 'Sphota' remains unaffected for ever, just as the soul is Eternal and immutable, though the body is subject to all kinds of mutations. For pragmatic reasons we superimpose mutations of the body upon the

immutable soul, similarly all sorts of changes are superimposed upon 'Sphota' which changelessly endures. From this standpoint it appears that the above Jaimini Sūtras though not directly applicable to the reality of 'sphota' yet do not contradict it.

'Sphota' is indivisible Identity, while audible sounds are many and hence divisible. Further, the Sūtra 'Nadavrddhiparā' (1/1/17) clearly shows that if many persons utter a sound, its volume increases, but 'Logos' as Absolute Reality neither increases nor decreases in volume. Sound varies in volume but 'sphota' has no variation. What Jaimini calls 'Nāda', according to Patanjali that is 'Dhvani' or audible sound. But sounds are external projections of one and the same absolute 'Logos'. Such an interpretation of Jaimini Sūtras naturally leads to the conclusion that there is practically, in ultimate analysis, little conflict between the two great sages Jaimini and Patanjali, and the Mīmāṅsa philosophy is not antagonistic to the 'Veda' which is known as 'Apauruseya Vākya' or self-evident truth, or word. It is evident from all the above arguments that Jaimini Sūtras are applicable to sounds uttered or unexpressed and do not contradict the reality of 'Sphota' Pārthasārathi Misra in his 'Shāstradipikā, a very important and authoritative work on Mīmāmsā on the lines of Kumarila has tried to prove the Eternality of the 'Word'. His view is that according to the Mīmāmsā the 'Word' is eternal. In support of the eternality of the 'Word', we have the presumption founded upon the fact that the meaning of the 'Word' cannot be comprehended except on the supposition

of its eternality. If the 'Word' be regarded as a separate unit just produced at each utterance of it, then its meaning could never be comprehended; because this comprehension rests upon the comprehension of the relation of concomitance of (Tādātma Sambanḍha) between the 'Word' and its meaning or Artha or object, and no such comprehension could be apprehended if at each utterance, the 'Word' were a separate unit and not the same identical 'Word' for all eternity. In fact, in order to explain the fact of the comprehension of meaning of a word, the 'Word' must be regarded as one and the same identical tattva or Reality. Further the fact of recognition is a clear enough evidence in support of the eternality of Śabda or Word. Recognition is a kind of perception. In it what is perceived and apprehended is the present object as qualified by the identity of the same object as remembered. On account of this the word must be eternal. And the reason for this lies in the fact that the 'Word' heard to-day is actually recognised as the same that was heard on previous occasions and that when there is utterance of the same word, it only serves to manifest the eternal 'Word' or 'Logos' it does not create or produce it. Hence 'Word' can never be produced or regarded as an effect and not being an effect, it cannot be perishable and it persists in its own form in spite of changes in sound-impressions or letters, it must be eternal. Here the great commentator on Mimāmsā seems to echo the view of the Śabdābrahmavādins who hold that Śabda or the word is eternal, non-perishable (Shāstradipika). This interpretation of the

Mimāmsā philosophy is a clear enough pointer to the fact that the Mimāmsā doctrine of Sree Jaimini and Sree Kumarila are neither antagonistic to the Vedas nor to the reality of 'sphota' as held by the ancient Grammarians and Tāntrik Acharyas. If they hold that the 'Word' is eternal, then it cannot mean a compound of letters and alphabets nor a conglomeration of varying sounds which must be temporal and fluctuating. The inevitable conclusion which we are forced to draw here what Sree Pārthasārathi Misra means by 'Word' is the same thing what the Acharyas of saivagama and ancient grammar mean by 'Sphota'. Later commentators are responsible for the conflict between Mīmāṅsha philosophy and the Philosophy of ancient Grammarians. It may be argued by some that such interpretation of Jaimini Sūtras is after all a forced innovation and what the commentators have said cannot be set aside as ad hoc interpretation. In reply to this charge, it may be said that in cases where great sages differ we have got to refer the dispute to the arbitration of the 'Śrutis'. In the Satapathabrahman it has been enjoined. "Vāgevarthaṃ paśyantī vāgjīvēti vāgārthaṃ nihitaṃ saṃtanotivacaiva viśvaṃ bahurūpaṃ nibaddhaṃ tadekasmādekaṃ pravibhajyopabhunte".

What the above sūtra means is that one and the same Absolute 'Logos' or Parāvāk gradually unfolds its meaning through various stages. This objective world is nothing but a self-projection of the Absolute 'Logos' 'Parā-vāk' which is manifested in the variety of objects through diversity of sounds and forms. The Śrutipramāna which emphasises

the identity of Śabda by the phrase 'Ekasmādekam' i.e. 'from the one to the one' is clearly indicative of the non-mutability and indivisibility of the 'Logos'. If this be conceded to be the real intention of the 'Śrutis' those who admit 'Sphota' instead of being guilty of wrong interpretation of the sūtras referred to above, really give an interpretation in conformity with the spirit of the 'Śrutis'. There is no violation of the authority of the 'Śrutis' but on the contrary those who do not see eye to eye with this interpretation, in their turn may be said to be guilty of such a charge. It will be evident even to the superficial looker-on that in the 'Satapathbrāhmana' a distinction has been made between the temporal aspects of 'Logos' or Śabda and its immutable aspect. The temporal aspect undoubtedly refers to the externally projected sounds of the 'Logos' oı 'Sphota' as admitted by the Sphotavādins and the immutable aspect is indicative of the 'Logos' or 'Sphota' itself. Jaimini too seems to distinguish between dynamic sound or 'Nāda' which is ever changing and immutable 'Sabda' or 'Logos'. It should be noted here that the Joga Philosophy of Patanjali Mahābhāṣya and Jaimini Smriti are equally authentic as their aphorisms are regaıded as 'Smriti' and by the woıd 'Smriti' we mean perpetuating the real implications of the Vedas. So there can be no conflict between 'Smriti' and 'Śruti'. When great exponents of 'Smṛiti' like Patanjali and Jaimini admit the doctrine of 'Sphota' or 'Logos', such an admission can, on no account, be said to be in conflict with the Śrutis. If there was no support of the Vedās in favour of the reality of 'Sphota', Sree Vyāsa would neveı have committed himself to an

elaborate exposition of the philosophy of 'Sphota' or 'Logos' and Maharṣi Patanjali too in the 'Vibhūtipāda' of the Yoga Philosophy would never have made a distinction between 'Śabda' or 'Logos', Artha or meaning of object and Pratyaya or mental apprehension as implied in the aphorism, 'Sabdārtha-pratyāyanam', as a means for the realisation of 'Nirvikalpajnānam' or indeterminate knowledge. Such a distinction between Śabda, 'Logos', 'Artha' meaning or object and Pratyaya or mental apprepension clearly indicates that after the appearance and disappearance of any sound there persists some kind of Pratyaya or mental apprehension in the mind of the listener-in. In support of this contention the 'Mahābhāsya' enjoins. "Evaṃ tarhi sphoṭaḥ Śabdaḥ Dhvaniḥ śabdaguṇaṃ Katham ? Bheryāghātavat Tad-yathā bheryāghāto bherīmāhatya kaścidvimśatipadāni gacchati kaścidtriṃśat kaściccatvārimśat. Sphotastāvāneva bhavati. Dhvanikṛtā urddhih. Dhavani Sphotaśca śabdānāṃ dhvanistu khalu lakṣyate (Mahābhāṣya Nirnaya sāgara Edition. Pt. 1.517"). It is evident that Ṛviṣis reach the same destination in spite of different methods which their systems impose upon them. As a result they differ in respect of the means and not in respect of the end. Lastly, the admission of 'Sphota' has not only been enjoined by the Śrutis but also by ancient history and puranas. For the aim of ancient history and purana is to reveal the true implications of the Vedas. "Itihāsa-purāṇābhyāṃ vedārthamupavṛṃhayet" Mahābhārata.

The Mahābhārata, in ancient parlance, is regarded as an encyclopædic history. Harivaṅsa which

forms a part of the Mahābhārata in giving the quintessence of its teaching in the following śrutis.

'Ekāksharā vái Sarvā Vāk', Om-kāro vāgevedam sarvam', has clearly stated the following in support of 'Sphota'. In other words, all these aphorisms and verses indicate the reality of one absolute 'Vāk' of which this Universe is the manifestation. Addressing the supreme Deity, it has been said that 'HE' is the root 'mantra' or Word among all letters and the ultimate 'sphota' of all sounds and letters. "Akṣārāṇāmakarāstvaṃ Sphoṭastvaṃ varṇasaṃsayaḥ—Harivámṣa in Mahābhārata". The one absolute Word is projected into innumerable sounds through which innumerable letters are manifested. Those innumerable sounds emerge out of diffeient places of the body, viz., the tongue, vocal cord etc. Sounds are multifarious due to differences in Spatio-temporal relations, but the one absolute sound transcends space and time because all space-time relations or configurations ultimately merge into it. The 'sphota' oı the Absolute Word is the form and potency of all created sounds and letters. Differences in letters are due to name and form, but in ultimate analysis, they are external manifestations through the space-time medium. A coloured sound is not intelligible except on the supposition that there is also an indeterminate or uncoloured sound. Hence, all letters are coloured when we contrast them with the fundamental uncoloured 'Logos'. In the Bhāgvat Gita. Śrikṛṣṇa says : "Aksarāṇāmakārosmi—Gītā". To explain, various sounds through the medium of space and time are projected into the etherial region due to self-pro-

jecting activity of one absolute Word. Thus 'sphota' or 'Ānataraprаṇava' is the ultimate indeterminate Logos. It is evident from the Mahābhārata that the author of the great history supported the doctrine of 'sphota' while rejecting Varnavāda. Letters arise and are destroyed, but the 'sphota' is indivisible, indestructible ultimate Reality. Thus it is evident that this Universe of matter, life and mind, is the emergence of one absolute dynamic self-conscious, self-luminous spiritual Power in which innumerable words with their meanings and sounds exist as latent tendencies. Achārya Vartṛhari has nicely put the whole thing within the compass of a very beautiful verse, 'Abhrāṇyeva pracīyante Śabdākhyāh paramāṇavah.." (Vākyapadiya-Bhrhmakānḍo).

In the Vedas it has been enjoined that in the beginning Prajapāti was the primordial creator who alone was this universe. He was conjoined to Vāk and this Vāk issued forth out of Him. This Vāk was his Śakti or power which was one with Him. This Prajapāti was the first 'will-to-create' associated with Vāk which together constitutes the form and potency of all creation. This potency of creation is the same thing as 'Sphota' advocated by ancient Grammarians. It unfolds itself through various stages and then recoils in the 'will-to-create'. At the time of involution it remains one with it as a latent power in Brahmā. "Prajāpatirvái idam āsīt tasya vāk dvitīyā āsīt sā asmad apakrāmat sā unah prajāh asṛjata sā, prajāpatim eva punah prāvisat. In the Brihadāraṇyaka upaniṣad it has been said "Sa tayāvāchā tena atmanā idam sarvam asṛjata yad idam kincha ṛcho yajūmshi sāmāni chhandāmsi

yajnān prajāh pastūm". In other words by Him was brought into existence the vedas, metres, sacrifices, all other living creatures and every thing comprising the universe of objects. In the Mahābhārata, (in the Vānaparva) Gāyatrī has been called the Mother of the Vedas, for Gāyatrī Devī is the form of Vāk. 'Vāk' in the Brihadāranyāka upanisad has been enjoined "Vāchaiva samrād Brahma jnāyate vāg vai samrāt paramam Brahmah"; i.e. the Brahman is known in and through vāk. Vāk is the supreme Brahma. The Taittirīya Brāhmana enjoins that the vāk is the matrix of the Vedas and the substance of immortality. The sāradatilak Tantra says "Adhāre Sarvvabhūtānām Sphurantī Vidyudākṛtiḥ Saṇkhāvarttākramāddevi Sarvvamāvrtya tiṣṭhti Kuṇḍalibhūtasarpānām aṅgaśriyamupeasi Sarvvavedamaī devi Sarvvamantramayee Śive Sarvvatattvamayī Sākṣāt Sūkṣmāt Suksmatara Vibhuh Tridhāma jananī Devi, Śabda-brahmaswarūpinī, Sāradatilaka —1 Patala. Iu other words, the ultimate Brahmah is Śabda itself. It is the intrinsic 'Sphota' which is at the root of all sounds, of all letters and which is one with its meaning. "Abhrānyēva pracīyante śabdākhyāḥ paramāṇavaḥ—vākyapadīya, Brahmakāṇḍa, 112.

It is therefore a stubborn fact that the reality of 'sphota' has been established, vindicated by the śrutis, and ancient history. We have already said that every word is intrinsically or organically related to its meaning, and meanings in words are manifested through conscious centres. Thus in ultimate analysis this Universe of internal and external objective facts appear to be self-projections of one

absolute Consciousness which is Parāvāk. Consciousness is not only revealer of objective facts and objective relations, but is intrinsic to them. It is the self-same dynamic Consciousness which is externalised into an external world and internalised into infinite psychical centres. As these are emanations out of the same fundamental Reality, they are not to be understood as completely bifurcated from each other. They are distinct no doubt, but all such distinctions are reconciled in one absolute supreme Consciousness.

CHAPTER III.

Determinate sounds and indeterminate 'Sphota' or 'Logos'

Letters are manifested through their respective sounds. Combinations of letters form words and words are manifested through their respective sounds. As for example, the sound 'God' is constituted by the sounds produced by the utterance of 'G', 'O' and 'D'. It is a synthesis of three distinct sounds. Now all these particular sounds reveal 'sphota' in the sense that they gradually unfold or manifest 'sphota'. Here the Mimānsakas may say that if any preceding sound manifests the 'Sphota' or 'logos', then other succeeding sounds become superfluous. In reply to such objection, the ancient Grammarians say that each and every sound is necessary for the gradual revelation of 'sphota' or 'Logos'. If each preceding sound be incapable of manifesting 'sphota' then their collocation or combination could never reveal it, e.g. an assemblage of blind persons can never attest to seeing anything. When we place a gem in the hand of a jeweller, its correct evaluation may not be apprehended by him at once, but as he goes on examining and observing the jewel, he is able to evaluate it correctly. Similarly, all those different sounds which constitute the sound configuration, 'God', as in the above example, gradually reveal the indeterminate 'sphota' or 'Logos'. In other words, the indeterminate absolute 'Sphota' manifests itself in and through determinate sounds and ultimately remains in its

pristine immutability without being affected in any way. All sounds gradually merge into the 'Sphota' or 'Logos'. In short ancient Grammarians advocate the doctrine that the indeterminate 'sphota' can never be revealed except through determinate sounds. "Na so'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamāt ṛte. Anubiddhamivam jnanam artham sabdena bhasate—(Vakyapadiya)".

In other words, there can be no knowledge which is not obtained through sounds uttered or unuttered; so without sounds which manifest letters, there can be no knowledge of the 'sphota' or 'Logos'. It may be said that every sound finds expression through its appropriate letter or letters. Sounds may be said to be the 'informing spirit' and letters to be its 'body'. Just as mind without a body is inconceivable, similarly 'sphota' or 'Logos' is inconceivable without sounds, and sound is inalienable from letters. But it may be argued that 'sphota' or 'Logos' being indeterminate and absolute and sounds being determinate, relative and phenomenal cannot in their nature reveal the indeterminate transcendental 'sphota'. Sounds embodied in letters cannot manifest the disembodied indeterminate 'sphota' the temporal cannot manifest the eternal, instants of time cannot manifest that which transcends time. The problem that arises here is, 'in what precise way determinate sounds be related to indeterminate absolute 'sphota' or 'Logos' ? In answer to this query it may be pointed out that as a piece of rope remains identical in itself and at

the same time may appeai as a snake, similarly the eternal absolute indeterminate 'Logos' projects itself in so many sounds embodied in letters. As such the objection loses its point altogether, for such an objection already takes for granted a real relation between phenomenal sound and transcendental 'Logos', which in the nature of the case is not possible. Why reality appears different from what it is in itself is explained by assuming the obscurative power of Nescience or 'Avidyā' which remains latent in 'sphota' but which projects out of 'sphota' due to beginningless stream of desires in individuals to be ultimately transcended in the stage of emancipation. Ancient Grammarians like Sri Bhartṛhari holds the view that 'sphota' is the equilibrated state of the power of 'Vidyā' and 'Avidyā' i.e. of its self-revealing power and self-obscurating power where no differentiation can be made. This obscurative 'nescience' which inheres in the Absolute indeterminate 'Sphota' or 'Logos' as its own latent power for the manifestation of letters and sounds is the cause of all erroneous perceptions. When we know reality in its true character, then error due to non-cognition of its true nature disappears and reality in its pristine nature is revealed. When we know the conch-shell as a conch-shell, non-cognition of its true nature which is the cause of erroneous perception disappears and the conch-shell no longer appears as silver. It should be noted here that it is 'sphota' itself which is projected into so many sounds and letters. When conch-shell appears as silver and when such error vanishes, there remains two separate cognitions viz. cogni-

tion of conch-shell and cognition of silver. But in the case of 'sphota' ancient Grammarians do not admit separate existence of letters and sounds independent of 'sphota'. It is the self-same absolute 'sphota' which due to its own obscurative power of nescience bifurcates itself into a world of sounds and letters through space-time medium. The moot point that is to be discussed here is that 'sphota' being indeterminate cannot be apprehended by the senses. But sounds are determinate and they are apprehended by auditory sense. 'How can that which affects the senses reveal that which transcends sense-experience?' When sounds come in contact with auditory sense, we have knowledge of sounds, but how can sounds reveal 'sphota' which is beyond space-time, beyond the senses, beyond anything that changes? Sounds belong to the world of flux, they are subject to all sorts of mutations, but 'sphota' is immutable, eternal, beyond the space-time flux 'Anādinidhanam'. In other words, 'how can the temporal manifest the Eternal in which time remains merged'? This problem has been discussed in various ways in Indian Philosophical Systems.

According to non-dualism or "Adwaitavāda" when we perceive a snake in the locus of a rope, in other words, when we mistake a rope for a snake, the projection of an unreal snake takes place and there is a contact between this unreal snake and the eyes and thus there is direct apprehension of an unreal snake. But this unreal snake cannot be said to be an existential fact, for an existential fact can in no time be non-existent.

"Trikālābādhittvameva Sattyamhi"

In other words, the characteristic of that which exists is that it can never be non-existent either in the past or in the present or in the future. But such unreal snake at the time of true cognition no longer exists. On the contrary, we cannot say that this unreal snake is non-existent, as there is the cognition of the unreal snake which is an undeniable fact of experience, it cannot be absolutely non-existent; for cognition of that which never exists is absurd, and non-being cannot be the object of perception. Thus such unreal snake can neither be said to exist nor be said to be non-existent. The only alternative therefore left to us is to call it "Anirvachaniya", or an alogical indefinable category. The illusory snake appears as a sense-datum due to the obscurative principle of Nescience. When such Nescience disappears the being of this illusory snake vanishes and there is cognition of its locus. According to Advaita Vedānta when nacre is perceived as silver, what takes place is this—upon the nacre-delimited consciousness, "Suktyāvacchinna Chaitanya," the beginningless positive obscurative veil of the principle of Nescience, 'anādibhāvarupajnāna' happens to be thrown. When the eyes come into contact with nacre in a general way, the veil of obscuration is partly dispelled by the cognitive modification of 'Antaḥkaraṇa' which takes the form of 'this' 'idamākāravṛttiḥ; the veil of Nescience however continues to obscure the nacrehood of what is seen as 'this' or 'idam' and supplemented by the prepossessions of the knower's mind and the similarity between the object perceived as 'this' and silver

undergoes modification. The result is that actual silver comes into being also with the cognition of silver, which is but a cognitive modification of the obscurative principle of Nescience. "Śuktyāvacchinnachaitanyādhiṣṭhitāvidyā rajatarūpēṇa rajatākāravṛttirūpēṇa ca parinamate" (Advaita-paribhaṣa). The silver which thus comes into being is the creation or construction of Nescience and is relatively real. It is 'Anirvacanīya' or inscrutable in the sense that it can neither be said to exist nor absolutely non-existent nor both. Thus according to the Advaita Vedāntin the object of 'bhrama' or illussory experience is relatively real and comes into being along with 'bhrama', persists as long as such experience persists and disappears with the disappearance of such illusion. Further this obscurative Nescience is the cause of the being of unreal silver. It may, however, be pointed out that the cause being of the same order as the effect, the obscurative principle of Nescience being admittedly the cause both of the empirical silver and the illusory silver can hardly be called the cause of such different orders of being. Secondly, if due to the magical potency of Nescience there be the coming into being of a piece of unreal silver, then no error arises, at least for the time when no second cognition appears to reject it; for a piece of nacre is directly apprehended as possessing the property of nacre. If it be said that the error is not due to "that" of nacre but to its "what", it may be said that a mere "that" which is not a "what" is a 'threadbare residium of logical chopping'. Further according to the Vedāntins universals or class-characteristics like 'snakehood' etc. are neither created nor destroyed.

But if the class-characteristic viz. snakehood signified by the class 'snake' be created along with the apprehension of the illusory snake, then we are to admit its repeated creation and destruction. In that case they will be involved in self-contradiction. In this connection the following remarks of Acārya Śaṅkara will be found pertinent "Rajjvāṃ bhujangahetau pıabhavāvināśau yathā nysta jagadutpattivināśe na ca kāraṇamasti tapvadiha". (Prapancasāra 50).

In other words, as there is no creation or destruction of unreal snake in the locus of a real rope, so there can be no creation and destruction of this universe in the locus of the Absolute Brahma. Moreover if Brahma or the Absolute be regarded as the material cause of the universe, then we cannot help concluding that somehow or other Brahma becomes subject to mutations and thus loses its immutability and absoluteness. Lastly it may be pointed out that with the disappearance of error, there remains no longer the apprehension of a snake in the locus of a rope. But how can it be held that a snake which is created also disappears? Knowledge of a thing may disappear but with its disappearance, it does not follow that the object of knowledge also disappears. The great sage, Vyāsdeva in his commentary on 'yoga-Sūtra' has mentioned the following characteristic mark of erroneous apprehension. "Viparyyayomithyā jñānamadad rūpapratiṣṭham". 3/8—Pātañjala Yogadarsanaṃ.

In other words, erroneous apprehension is due to the apprehension of a thing as possessing a Class-

characteristic which does not belong to that thing; e.g. snake-hood does not belong to a piece of rope, yet a rope is apprehended to be a snake with the Class-characteristic of snakehood. When we do so, we have erroneous apprehension. The point to be noted here is that the above characteristic mark of erroneous apprehension as stated by Patanjali is a pointer to the fact that error is not factual but arises as a matter of judgment. Another remarkable point which is worthy of consideration in this connection is that Sree Vyāsa nowhere in the 'Brahmasutra' ever tried to formulate the characteristic mark of erroneous apprehension. The absence of any sutra defining the nature of erroneous apprehension clearly goes to show that Sri Vyāsa was of the same opinion with regard to the subject matter as enjoined in Patanjali Yogasūtra and this explains why in the 'Brahma-Sūtra' there is no discussion about the nature of erroneous apprehension. It thus appears that later commentators ought to have accepted the aforesaid definition of erroneous apprehension and if they failed to understand the true intention of Sree Vyāsa, they should be held guilty of not admitting the veracity of verbal testimony or 'sabda pramāṇa' which is an accepted source of knowledge by the commentators of Vedanta like Acārya Śaṅkara himself. The Sānkhya philosophy also has raised the following objection against the 'Anirvachanīya Khyātiḥ' advocated by commentators of Vedānta. "Nāhirvvacanīyasya Khyātiḥ"

Sāṃkhya Sūtra, 5/54.

In other words, there can be no apprehension of an indefinable illusory object. Every object is

either existent or non-existent and between the existent and the non-existent, there is no tertium quid known as indefinable 'illusory object'. Nobody can point out an experience of indefinable illusory object as such. The great commentator Vācaspati Miśra also in his 'Bhāmati' has supported the view of error as a matter of judgment in the following lines.

"Apūrvvo'pi mithyāpratyayo pradarśita eva Cidātmanyadhyāsyate, Cidātmā tu Śrutyādigocaraḥ Sattvenaivānirvvācyaḥ".

The true import of the above comment is that we are in the habit of superimposing body on pure consciousness which is the self as it is in itself. But Śrī Vāchaspati Miśra has nowhere said that this unreal universe is created in the locus of Absolute Consciousness. Those who admit the creation of 'the illusory snake' will be forced to acknowledge that the celebrated author of 'Bhāmati' ought to have stated 'Cidātmani Utpadyatey' instead of stating as he does 'CHIDATMANI ADHYASYATE" In other words, Śrī Vācaspati Miśra ought to have admitted that there is the creation of an illusory universe in the locus of the Absolute consciousness instead of saying that there is superimposition of a universe in the locus of Absolute consciousness. Acārya Śaṅkarā too in his 'Prapañchasāra' does not admit the creation of an illusory object. The following quotation from the above remark, "Jvalanāt dhūmodgatibhir-vividhākṛtirambare yathā bhāti tadvadvivisṇau sıṣṭiḥ ya māyayā dvaita vistara bhāti."

(Prapanchasāra 33).

He has accepted the verb 'Bhāti' which means appearance and not the verb 'Utpadyate' which means creation. It may be pointed out that if we admit the creation of illusory object and if such illusory object be indefinable in logical terms, the familiar distinction technically called by him Vyāvahārika and Prātibhāsika apprehensions respectively disappear. To explain, when we place a red flower by the side of a crystal, the crystal appears to be red and such apprehension according to the Adwaita Vedantists is indefinable and Prātibhāsika. It is also admitted by the Vedantist that transparent crystal appearing as red is pragmatically erroneous apprehension and cognition of such erroneous apprehension is indefinable in logical terms. If this be so, there can be no distinction between an actual transparent crystal and a crystal which appears to be red. If it be said that when the red flower is removed, crystal remains as crystal but a crystal where there is no red flower remains as it is in itself and the difference between the two is due to the former's proximity to a red flower—such argument seems to be fallacious. For every pragmatic error though Vyāvahārika is transitory and therefore is subject to rectification e.g. when we know the Absolute, pragmatic error in respect of the world as a whole disappears. Therefore, both pragmatic error and error arising out of mistaking reflection for the thing reflected vanishes as soon as the cause of the mistake is known. Therefore, critically considered the distinction between two illusory objects 'Vyāvahārika' and Prātibhāsika is uncalled for. Thus it appears that as both kinds of erroneous apprehension are indefinable, there can be no distinction between the

two. Further an erroneous apprehension implies such knowledge of an object which has no real existence in the ordinary sense. But can such knowledge be possible? Contact between the sense and the objectively real is possible but contact between the sense and the objectively unreal can never be possible. Therefore knowledge of an object which is indefinable can never be admitted, for such knowledge presupposes the independent existence of an indefinable object which is absurd. Ancient Grammarians in this regard seem to be on a better footing, for they admit a distinct psychosis or technically called 'Āntaranjān' which is independent of external objects and advocate the doctrine that without this distinctive psychosis there can be no apprehension of external reality. Maharṣi Patanjali in his 'Yogdarshana' has mentioned such distinctive psychosis as apprehension through mere sound independent of objective facts. But strangely enough the Vedantist does not admit such distinctive psychosis and therefore they cannot say that the indefinable snake belongs to the category of such psychosis. Further ancient Grammarians like Acārya Bhartṛhari unmistakably assert that in dreams we have confirmation of such distinctive psychosis independent of objective facts. "Śabdajñānānupāti vastu-śūnyo vikalpaḥ".

According to the Vedantist external objects appear as such through contact with the senses which take the form of such object as an external fact. Similarly in the case of illusion, unreal snake appears as such to the minds coming in contact with and

taking the form of such object. But according to ancient Grammarians there is no necessity of admitting the objectivity of an unreal snake and thus conceding to the realistic instinct. This universe teeming with objective facts exist in the mind as distinctive psychoses and these being ideally real exist independently of objective facts. They alone are capable of being projected through the doors of the senses as external objects. Therefore in cases of illusion the necessity of empirical contact with external objects does not arise at all. But the Vedantist is not in a position to admit the case of the distinctive psychosis as independent of objective reference. If, however, we do not admit the contact of an unreal object with the senses, they will be forced to admit distinctive 'Psychosis' independent of external object. In any case the Adwaita Vedantist has no other alternative but to admit the being of such distinctive 'psychoses'. In this context the conclusion arrived at by ancient Grammarians and Acārjyas of Tantraśāstras seem to be on a comparative estimate, almost unique in the history of Philosophical thought. They find no ground whatsoever in making a distinction between the existent, the non-existent and that which is existent and non-existent and at the same time indefinable. According to them one and the same unique Absolute indeterminate 'sphota' polarises itself into the knower, knowledge and the known, the enjoyer, enjoyment and the object of enjoyment. In other words it polarises itself into a world of not-self. This is the all-comprehensive indeterminate Absolute power in which the powers of creation, preservation and destruction lie latent. Time as one of the latent

powers emerges first out of it. This emergence of Time is due to latent and beginningless desires in individuals. Every object is subject to six kinds of mutations through which Time as the great projector of all externalisation is realising itself. The first kind is birth. The manifestation of the unmanifested is known as birth. The being of a thing is manifested in and through its birth, in other words, we come to know of the existence of that thing through birth. When the plant remains unmanifested in the seed we do not know the existence of the plant. But as soon as the plant is born out of the seed, we become aware of its existence. The second kind of mutation is known as transformation or 'Viparinam' which follows birth. The plant then undergoes transformation in every instant of time. Then follows growth and growth is followed by decay. Then the plant undergoes decay at every instant of time till it disappears in its own cause. This disappearance of the effect in its cause is known as death or destruction. Thus birth, existence, transformation, growth, decay and absorption in the cause form the six stages of one omnipotent universal magnificent Power which is Time. For all expression proceeds through the past, realises itself in the present and has 'Nisus' towards the future. All expressions or 'Prakāsa' presupposes the past, present and the future in time, without this, there can be no expression. But past, present and future are conceptual abstractions of one and the same indivisible, eternal Power which projects the world in its manifoldness.

In other words according to ancient Acāryas of Saivāgama, the indeterminate, indefinable abso-

lute power comprehends all other powers and this unitary principle or indeterminate absolute 'sphota' polarises itself into a universe of centres of forces. Thus error is not due to 'Māya' which according to the Advaita Vedāntist is a separate principle completely different from the absolute Brahman, neither the object of error is Anirvachanīya or some indefinable 'tertium quid', but error is due to the eternal self-bifurcating power of the Absolute which is inherent in it and which is projected into a world of objects through time due to its intrinsic dynamism. Thus the world of objects becomes pragmatically real and not absolutely unreal as the Vedantist seems to hold. Thus erroneous apprehension consists in the non-apprehension of a thing in its true nature and in apprehending that which is different from the reality as it is in itself e.g. we say mistaking a rope for a snake as erroneous apprehension, because there is non-apprehension of rope as a rope and apprehension of a snake in the locus of a rope which is not there as an objective fact. In this way erroneous apprehension has been characterised in Saivasidhānta. Simply to say that error is erroneous and its object the indefinable 'Anirvachanīya' is saying nothing of it. Truth exists by its own right as error too. For truth is the manifestation through time of 'Vidyāśakti' or the power of self-expression in the Absolute Sphota and error is the manifestation of 'Avidyāśakti' or the power of self-obscuration of the same ultimate Reality. They being emanations of one and the same unitary Absolute Sphota really form the positive and the negative poles of it. This 'Sphota' is the indeterminate Absolute ever realising itself in and through

the determinate or the temporal and at the same time transcending all temporal manifestations. Here we find a fundamental difference between the conclusions arrived at by the Vedantist and ancient Indian Grammarians. According to Vedāntist, the Absolute is indeterminate absolute Knowledge, but according to ancient Grammarians 'the Sphota' or absolute 'Logos' is the absolute reality without which knowledge is not possible. In other words knowledge implies the knower, knowing activity and the object of knowledge. But all these factors are manifested through time and therefore they are temporal configurations of the Absolute 'Logos'. This world of objects is ultimately projected centres of force out of an all-comprehensive indeterminate absolute self-conscious, self-luminous Power which is the 'Logos'. The world is not unreal or Anirvachanīya as the Vedantist holds. The Absolute is the form and potency of all creation. The universe is constituted by the Absolute and so cannot have any separate existence of its own.

Here the Nyaiyāikas may object that every material cause is subject to transformation or change e.g. the clay is transformed into a pot and thus when the pot is produced out of clay, clay itself undergoes change. On the destruction of the material cause the destruction of the effect follows e.g. when threads of a cloth are destroyed the cloth can no longer exist. 'Kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāba' Thus according to Nyaiyāikas, every material cause is subject to change and at the same time destructible. Thus, if we say that the absolute indeterminate Logos is the material cause of this universe of things, then

it will be mutable; it will be subject to change. It should be noted here that the term "material cause" or 'Upādān Kāran' has been used by the Grammarians in a very technical and special sense. They do not, like the Naiyāikas, hold that the effect is non-existent in the cause prior to its manifestation nor do they agree with Sānkhya Philosophy to hold the view that the effect is a real transformation of the cause. These two views are known in Indian Philosophy as 'Asatkāryavād' and 'Satkāryavād' respectively. The ancient Grammarians are known as 'Vivartabādins'. They say that the Absolute Logos is the material cause of this universe of things in the sense that the universe is 'Niṣedhavyāpararūpa' or self-abnegation of the Absolute and it neither originates from nor is a real transformation of the Absolute. The word 'vivarta' needs clarification here. 'Vivarta' as a process is explained by them in the following way. That which remains identical in-itself, without undergoing any transformation or change yet appears to be other than its true nature is said to have undergone the process of Vivarta e.g. the rope remains a rope without undergoing any real transformation though in the locus of a rope there is the appearance of a snake. It may be pointed out here that Vedantists like Acārya Śaṅkara also upholds the doctrine of Vivarta. But his followers seem to admit the production or creation of an unreal snake in the locus of the rope by the indefinable inscrutable Māyā which is not in Brahman either as a quality or as its essential nature. Māyā in its essential nature is absolute inertia and which by its magical potency brings into existence such a transcendentally unreal but empirically real

snake. The ancient Grammarians and Acāryas of Saivāgama, however, do not admit such a separate principle of Māyā. They say that the absolute 'Sphota' or 'Logos' is the material cause of the universe in the sense that there can be neither knowledge nor being of a thing which are not expressed or manifested through primodial sound or Absolute Logos. As the pot is permeated by clay, similarly knowledge of anything finds expression through the Absolute 'Logos' or the primordial sound. The point to be noted here is that according to Adwaita Vedāntists the Absolute in its true nature is 'Knowledge' and knowing and being in ultimate analysis are identical. In support of their thesis they quote the following from the Upaniṣad "SATYAM JNĀNAM ANANTAM BHAHMAN" etc. But ancient Acāryas of Āgam Sāstra and grammarians hold the view that knowledge is the manifestation of knowing activity, e.g. when we say "I know this pot"—we have apprehension of two things, one knowledge and the other the effort for the attainment of knowledge expressed through the verb 'to know'. In other words, knowledge without effort is never possible. But effort or activity is expressed through time. Therefore, all knowledge is manifested through time. Knowledge which transcends time is a figment of the imagination. "Time" is conceived in Agama-Sāstra as the great magnificent power or "Mahāmāyā". Thus the affirmation of the Absolute of the vedānta philosophy remains as a temporal act of the manifesting power inherent in Mahāmāyā or Kāla-sakti.

It can, therefore, be safely concluded that in the Vedānta there is no place for even the affirmation of the Absolute indeterminate Brahman without being the expression of the primordial 'Logos' under the stress of Kāla-sakti or Mahāmāyā. If they uphold the nature of the Absolute as pure knowledge, they cannot say in the same breath that the Absolute is indeterminate, for all knowledge is determinate; as without any determination by Time-power or Kāla-sakti there can be no knowledge. In support of the Vedantist, it may be argued that pure consciousness is the essence of all knowledge. Such knowledge is contentless, featureless and does not depend upon knowing activity or any other object. In perfectly dreamless sleep there is contentless, featureless consciousness, in other words consciousness changelessly endures without the knowledge of any object. That is, pure self-knowledge is pure self-consciousness. When we wake up from the state of perfectly dreamless sleep, we are in the habit of saying that we slept so soundly that there was no awareness of any object and as in such a state there was no object nor awareness of any object, yet we can recall such contentless state and thus we are forced to admit such an indeterminate uncoloured state of Absolute self-knowledge. It may be said, however, what the Vedantists assert as 'Nirupādhika Jñāna' or contentless knowledge is not really contentless or indeterminate, as without a sense of personal identity there can be no knowledge. I slept soundly and at present I am awakened from sound sleep—these two kinds of knowledge arise out of a sense of personal identity and such knowledge involves effort. Knowledge which persists in a state of perfectly

dreamless sleep is not devoid of any effort. It is manifested through the activity of sleep and as such it involves effort, it comes under the influence of Time or 'Kāla-sakti'. Therefore such knowledge is not really indeterminate but is determinate and cannot be called the Absolute. To speak of the Absolute to be in relation is to contradict the very nature of Absolute as such. Thus when the Vedantist speaks of the indeterminate nature of the Absolute as pure knowledge, they determine the Absolute and their Absolute is not really indeterminate, neither featureless nor contentless.

Further in support of their thesis, the Vedāntists may argue that knowledge is self-revealing. The presupposition of all knowledge is the self, the 'I' or the metaphysical subject. Therefore self-consciousness is identical with pure consciousness. Objects which are not self-conscious are said to be dead and inert. By inertness we usually mean something different from self-consciousness or 'Ahāmpratīti' which is absolutely absent and which is devoid of any activity but an Absolute with the state of inertness is inconceivable. But any admission of 'inertness' implies that it exists or has being—in other words the verb 'to be' manifests 'inertness'. In cases where other verbs are not applicable, there must be application of verb "to be". When we say "Rāma is" what we mean is that "Rāma" as an object of fact is manifested through the verb "to be". Thus the knowledge of Rāma is obtained through the verb "to be". Thus for our knowledge of inertness there must be the application of verb "to be", such as the pot exists or the table exists. It is,

therefore evident that a thing is because it is manifested by the verb "to be", that is, the verb "to be" is the manifesting power revealing inertness. Thus there is no such thing which is free from any activity and there can be no knowledge which is independent of effort or stress. Thus knowledge is not self-revealing as it is revealed through effort or activity. All objects are manifested through time. Eliminate Time-power and you eliminate 'being' and expression. The great exponent of Āgama Siddhānta Ācārya Abhinavagupta in his epoch-making book "Īsvara Pratyabhijnyā Vimaśrini" has very nicely put the whole argument in a nut-shell "Tena āntarikriyā śaktijñānadeva svatsḥsiddhā svaprakāśā saiva tu svaśaktyā prānapūryyaṣṣṭaka kramena sarīramapi sañcaramānāspandanarūpā satī vyāpārātmikā māyāpade'pi prāmāṇasya pratyakṣyādervisayaḥ

(Iśvara-pratyābhijnā vimarṣiṇī Vol. I etc.)

In other words that subtle metaphysical will-power which is ever realising itself as a stress or 'Spandan' in everything, is the efficient cause of the manifestation of all knowledge. When we say that a baby has knowledge, we infer the existence of such knowledge through the movement of his limbs. In other words it is through effort that we infer the existence of knowledge. Time-power in unison with will-power is revealed through the medium of a body which in its turn gives expression to all knowledge. "Tatrajñānam svataḥ siddham kṛyākāyaśritā satī Pai airapyūpa lakṣyeta tayānya jñāna mūhyate". "Iśvarapratyavijnā" Ch. I. etc. Kārika 4

Further it has been said that knowledge is self-revealing and devoid of any stress. If knowledge is expression and if the self is of the nature of knowledge, then by self-revelation we will have to mean revelation of revelation which is nothing but quibbling in words. Moreover if knowledge, in ultimate analysis, be devoid of any stress, then it will be self-contradictory to say that it has expression, for all expression implies effort. And, if knowledge which is of the nature of revelation be not manifested, how can there be any knowledge of its existence. Further whenever we say we have knowledge, we mean knowledge exists—in other words knowledge is revealed through the verb 'to be'. Therefore the nature of knowledge as enjoined in the Vedānta is not self-revealing or Svaprakāsa. Further it may be pointed out that when there is knowledge of the Absolute, all error vanishes, in other words, when we have true knowledge, we have this feeling 'I know with certainty'. When there is apprehension of certain knowledge, we have the apprehension of two things one, the object of knowledge and the other, the subject of knowledge. The use of such distinct expressions as subject and object involves knowledge through the use of words which are manifested through sounds. Thus both the subject and the object are really not two different things, neither they have any independent existence of their own. These two words 'subject' and 'object' find expression through Śabda and therefore knowledge of Absolute which transcends Śabda nowhere exists. Thus they arrive at the conclusion that all knowledge is manifested through Śabda or Sphota which is the one Absolute reality.

"Na so'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamātṛte
Anuviddhamiva jñānaṃ śarvaṃ śabdena gamyate".

(Vākyapadīya, Brahmakāṇḍa).

In other words, knowledge is the self-revelation of Śabda. Moreover knowledge cannot be of the same nature as the self. The self is all-pervading, self-revealing and devoid of any stress. It is, in other words, indeteıminate Consciousness which is indivisible and immanent in all things. As knowledge is manifested through Śabda, it is not self-revealing and therefore it is not the self and when we say we have knowledge what is implied is that it ıs present. In other words ıt finds expressions through time and thus it cannot be of the nature of self which transcends time. Moreover as it is expressed through time it cannot be devoid of 'Spandan' or stress. The conclusion which we are forced to draw here is that knowledge cannot be identical with the self. Further as knowledge is not a self-revealing principle, it cannot manifest other objects also e.g. light being self-manifesting principle is capable of revealing all other objects but gross inert things like tables and chairs do not reveal themselves and therefore cannot reveal other objects. Thus as knowledge is not self-revealing or self-manifesting principle it cannot be the principle of manifestation of all other objects. "Jñānañca citsvarūpaṃ cet tad anityaṃ kimātmavat athāpi jaḍametasya kathamartha prakāśatā". Īsvarapratyavijnā Vimarṣiṇi. First Chapter Kārikā-7.

In other words, unless knowledge permeates its object it cannot manifest that object. When light

penetrates and pervades objects there is manifestation of objects. In a dark room where there is no illumination there is no vision of any object but as light is brought and its illumination penetrates the objects in and around it, we know that there are objects. Similarly knowledge which cannot manifest itself is inert and being inert it has no independent existence, neither has it any distinct power to reveal any object or to give us knowledge of any object. Thus knowledge by itself cannot give us knowledge of objects. With regard to this point, the view of Sāṅkhya Philosophers is worthy of consideration. The Sāṅkhya Philosophers hold the opposite view and say that granting that knowledge is a passive state or event, there is no reason why it should not manifest other objects, for according to Sāṅkhya, the 'understanding' or 'Buddhi' is a subtle product of Prakṛti which by its proximity to purusha which is of the nature of consciousness reveals its object. Just as a mirror due to its proximity to light reflects all objects around it, similarly the understanding due to its proximity to consciousness reflects objects of the world. But the objects of knowledge cannot be identical with knowledge itself. If the object of knowledge is of the nature of knowledge, the question arises whether all objects of knowledge are identical with knowledge or whether any specific object is of the nature of knowledge. If it be said that all objects are of the nature of knowledge, then we will be forced to admit that all objects are omniscient and omniscience is present in all objects; but this is absurd. The other alternative is that some specific object is of the nature of knowledge. If that be so, all other objects will remain unknown

and unknowable, excepting that specific object. But this is also absurd. Therefore according to sāṅkhya philosophy the principle of understanding must be separately admitted. Because it is transparent due to preponderance of 'Satta' element, it has the capacity to reveal all objects; though partially according to Sāṅkhya philosophy it is not without activity or Rajas element and Inertia or Tamas element. That is why the understanding or 'Buddhi' cannot reflect all objects simultaneously. With the predominance of Satwa element, the understanding reflects objects and we have knowledge. Thus the understanding though a product of 'Prakṛti' being predominated by the Satta element is capable of manifesting other objects. It has already been pointed out that according to Sāṅkhya Philosophy consciousness is reflected on the understanding. But this argument is fallacious. For the medium of reflection is always more transparent than the object reflected, as a mirror being more transparent can reflect grosser things like physical objects but if the tenets of the Sāṅkhya philosophy be admitted, it will appear that pure consciousness will be grosser than the understanding. In that case consciousness as a superior reality will be inferior to understanding. Further according to them reflected consciousness is the revealer of objects. This is tantamount to admitting that reflection is not devoid of any activity. But it is absurd to think that reflection or shadow is endowed with effort or activity. If fire be reflected in a mirror, then that reflected fire certainly cannot burn a piece of log. This shows that there is a difference between the thing reflected and its reflection. Activity belongs to the thing, while re-

flection as a mere appearance is devoid of any activity. Fire has the power to burn but its reflection is incapable of burning anything. Thus it is evident that understanding which is a product of Prakṛti is devoid of any activity or power of manifestation. "Ajaḍā saivam jāḍyenārtha prakāśatā". (Isvarapratya Vijñāvimarṣinī) 1/2/8. Thus it is 'Citi' or absolute Consciousness which is inalienable from 'Prakāsa' or expression and the primordial Logos in its Vibrata or act of self-projection is the only self-revealing Reality and the form and potency of all activities under the stress of Kāla-Śakti or Sad-Vidyā. "Atha mukhya prakāśarūpameva tat prativimbakaṃ tat tarhi buddheravystiriktam iti mukhyaprākāśarūpayava buddhirjātā. Yato viruddhadharmmādhyāsāt bhīrubhiḥ etat kalpitam. Sa eva punaḥ jājvalyamānam nijaṃ ojo jṛmbharyati tataśca sā buddhireva cinmayi syāt kim puruṣeṇa. (Īsvarapratyābhijña vimarṣiṇī).

CHAPTER IV.

Time, the great magnificent power.

Avyāhatakalā yasya kālaśaktimupāśritā janmādayo vikārāḥ ṣaṭ bhava-bhedasya yonayaḥ.

Vākyapadīya Brhmakānda.

Ancient Grammarians like Sri Bhaṛtṛhari conceives of time as the medium through which Śabda polarises itself into the multiplicity of objects which is the Universe. Time is not to be identified with Śabda, for Śabda is indeterminate and all determination or 'Vivarta' is manifested through Time-power. Neither time can be conceived of as a separate entity; for in that case time will have to be accepted as an independent reality besides 'Śabda'. Between Śabda and Time-power there is distinction but there can be no absolute separation. Time is, therefore, the great Omnipotent Magnificent Power through which 'Parā-vāk' or Absolute Śabda unfolds itself into the many. Before there be any manifestation or expression, Time-power remains identified with Śabda. Time being the 'conditio sine quibos non' of all manifestation and prius of all creation cannot be identified with any created thing. It being the creative urge in Eternity cannot be identified with any created thing and therefore cannot be created. Further, every object that exists is in itself nothing but an outward manifestation of one ultimate Śabda, or 'Parā-vāk'. Now time being the efficient

cause of all manifestation cannot be qualified by any adjective. It neither exists nor can be said to be non-existent. If it does not exist, there can be no self-projection of the Absolute, for everything exists in and through time. We can never conceive of anything which did not exist in the past, does not exist in the present nor which can be believed to exist in future. In the language of the German Philosopher, Immanuel Kant, it may be said to be the apriori principle of all manifestation, objectification of the Absolute. All determinations and differentiations are due to the influence of Time. When Time merges itself into Eternity, there is absolutely no manifestation. But Time emerges due to Eternity and Infinity of desires in individuals. In ultimate analysis every object is nothing but a moment in Eternity, a temporal configuration. It is through time that all kinds of mutations like birth, decay and growth are manifested. The Universal Will-to-create which remains latent as potential energy or creative urge in the Absolute is actualised through Time-power. The absolute equipoise or perfect equilibrium which remains as a stress or 'Sphota' unmanifested becomes dynamic or manifested due to urgency of desires in individuals. Just as in the cultivator, there is first the desire to enjoy fruits by sowing the seed and just as potential energy in the seed becomes actualised or manifested in the plant through time, similarly desire-seeds or latent dispositions in individuals realise themselves in particular objects and persons through Time. When desires are annihilated Time recoils to itself and remains identified with the Absolute which is Śabda. Time, thus, being the principle of creation,

preservation and destruction is beyond and above all mutations, all change.

According to Āgama Śāstras, the ultimate Reality of this Universe is the great Absolute Power whose manifestation is this Universe. This Absolute Power is the form and potency of all other powers, forces, motions and energy. This Absolute Power being above all mutations or change cannot be subject to creation, preservation and destruction. Before any manifestation, Time remains dissolved into this Absolute Power. But due to Eternal desires in individuals this equipoise in Absolute Power is destroyed. This Absolute Power may be described as an equilibrium of the forces of creation, preservation and destruction. But when this equilibrium is broken there is a stress in the will-to-cieate or 'Sṛsikṣa' and Time emerges from a state of dissolution and it is through Time that all other powers evolve as secondary powers. Just as shadow manifests itself through a mirror, similarly, it is through the mirror of Time that this world of objects finds expression. The mirror reveals the fundamental unity as well as the distinction between reflection and the object reflected. Similarly Time is the mirror which manifests the unity as well as distinction between the Absolute and the Universe. The reflection has no separate independent existence from the object reflected, and therefore it is one with the object; at the same time the object reflected is not the same as reflection. Similarly, this Universe which is a projection of the Absolute is one with it as it is not self-existent. On the other hand it is distinct from the Absolute as it is subject to all mutations. This

fundamental unity and distinction between the Absolute and the Universe is revealed through Time. This is the great Omnipotent Power which causes the Absolute Consciousness to evolve into the world of objects and persons. According to Āgamsiddhānta, Time is not an abstraction, neither a mysterious 'elan vital' as the great French Philosopher, Henry Bergson supposed. Time is here conceived of as a metaphysical Reality or power of all expression. That is why Time has been conceived of as Kāli or the great Goddess of creation, preservation and destruction. The word 'KĀLI' in Sanskrit dictionary is derived from the root 'Kāla'. It signifies the power of movement, the power of self-projection, the power of self-ingression, it is the standard of measure, and condition of limitation. Time as the great magnificent power realises itself in and through 12 kinds of kalās.

"Kalanam ca gatiḥ kṣepojñānam gaṇanaṃ bhogīkaranaṃ śabdanam svātmalayīkarananca".

(Tantra Sāra, 4th Āhnika).

It has already been said that at the time of the dissolution of each creation, Time merges in the Absolute and the Infinite desires in individuals also are finally dissolved into it. Due to the influence of the latent dispositions of actions in individuals there is a stress in the Will-to-create. Time emerges and desires are actualised through moments and moments reveal succession in Time. Now the cause is the immediate antecedent to the effect.

It is Time which reveals succession, antecedents and consequents and moments are temporal configurations in Eternal Time. Now ideation is the pre-supposition of all objectification. It is prior to all experience of objective facts. If I ask a weaver engaged in his work "what are you doing ?" in reply he says "I am weaving cloth", but in reality so long as he does not finish his work, there is no cloth, yet the expression "I am weaving cloth" distinctly points to a finished cloth and not merely to the work of weaving. The question is "where is this finished cloth ?" It is not yet out there as an objective fact. We are thus forced to say that the cloth exists in the ideation of the weaver merely. Thus the statement "I am weaving cloth" really implies "I am giving objective expression to what is already there in ideation". Thus we see that Time is the cause which, in the first place, generates "Sṛṣṭikalpanā" or ideation of objective facts in the individual and which is one with him. This aspect of Time has been tenchically called "Atmalayeekarana" or in other words time is the factor in which all ideation remains identified with the subject or the self. In the second place, all kinds of mutations like birth, growth and decay that are found in objective facts find expression through Time. It is evident, therefore, that the function of Time is to project externally what is already there ideally. In other words, it is the agency through which the ideal appears as real, One Absolute becomes many through Time-power. In other words, it is the principle of differentiation. Time is the fundamental principle of all differentiation, particularisation or indi-

viduation. If there would be no time, things could not be distinguished from one another. Thirdly, it is also the principle or synthesis or unification of the ideal with the Real. Subjective states find expression in objective facts or appear as objective facts and Time reveals the self-identity and absoluteness of the ideal as well as its distinction from what is objectively real. The problem that arises here "how the Spiritual appears as the Real or how the Ideal becomes Real" ? Ideal water or subjective image of water cannot quench thirst. In other words, idea of water is not the same thing as water itself. In answer to this question, we find a beautiful and instructive argument put forward by ancient Grammarians like Bhartṛhari.

"Parāparatve mūrtānām deśabhedanibandhane tata eva prakalpyate kramarūpe'nu-kalpataḥ". (Vākyapadīya Brhmakāṇḍa.) Furthei, it is through the medium of space that Time gives concrete expression to what we ideally conceive as subjective states or ideas. Here we find a beautiful western parallel in Dr. Alexander's theory of 'Space-time'. When we conceive of anything oi know anything, we know it as happening in Time and occupying some space, however insignificant its magnitude may be. We can never think of anything, imagine anything which does not happen in Time, neither occupies some space. So, Time being supplemented by space reveals outward embodied objects. Now space reveals direction. Everything that has being must have also direction, for things without direction, i.e., north, south, east, west, right, left, before, after, forward, backward etc. is inconceivable.

Direction differentiates itself into ten kinds of changes like North, South, East, West etc., and this differentiation takes place through space. Now space without direction is meaningless—as space without Time is inconceivable. Thus time is not only the principle of objectification or individuation, but also the principle of all activities realised through space and direction. For example, it is through the movement of the Sun that directions are determined, but the movement of the Sun finds expression through Time. Thus we have knowledge of north, south, east, west etc. through Sun's movement and the Sun's movement is determined by Time. A thing appears to be distinct from another thing because we think of it as lying to the north or south or east or west or before or after another thing. Things without direction are without space. Spatial differentiation and temporal distinction determine the particularisation or individuation of a thing through Time. Even atoms or electrons are distinguished from one another by space-time and direction.

"Yataḥ prakalpate bhedo 'bhedastatrāpi dṛsyate ádvstoparatam bhedam ataḥ yuktataram viduḥ".

(Vākyapadīya,. kāṇḍa III)

An analogous argument may hereby stated from Tantrāloka. Eṣa kālo'hi devasya viśvābhāsanakāriṇī kṛyāsaktiḥ samastānāṃ tattvānāñca paraṃ vapuḥ (Tantrāloka, Ahnika VI, Verse 38).

In other words, Time as the Almighty Power appears as the world of objective facts and the determining principle of all kinds of activity or motion

as well as the indwelling, informing principle of all emergence and it is in time that all 'Becoming' is ultimately dissolved. Now activity implies the externalisation of Time in a world of objective facts. In other words this universe of objective facts and subjective states have their being, preservation and destruction in Time-power. Here activity is not conceived of as an independent power, but regarded as the power of self-objectification of Time. Thus Time is here conceived of as a dynamic factor evolved in the world of objects out of its own intrinsic dynamism. Now Time may be conceived under two aspects. Time at rest is a mere 'stress' and Time in motion is this objective universe of matter, life and mind.

This 'stress' or 'Sphota' is unmanifested Time or 'Avyākrita Kalā' which comprehends all becoming in a single unified system. At the moment of its being externalised through its intrinsic dynamism, it has been enjoined as the stress of life or in Sanskrit 'Prāṇa Spandanam'. "Śaiva sambid bahismatmāgarbhībhūtau kramākraman Sphuṭayantī prarohena prāṇa vṛttiritisthitā". When life remains identified in Time, there is no evolution or no expression. Now life is an expression of Will-power or Will to create, preserve and destroy. Will is the form and potency of all living organisms beginning from the minutest primitive protoplasmic cell down to its full-fledged expression in self-conscious persons.

The Universe of objective facts presents itself as having two aspects, identity and succession. Succe-

ssion is an expression of causation. As for example, clay and the pot. Clay is antecedent to pot and the pot is consequent to clay, but identity has no before and after. The rainbow appears as an identical whole of many colours. When we see the rainbow we see all the colours simultaneously present, we do not try to ascertain which colour comes first and which one appears after. When Time and Life remain dissolved or latent in one comprehensive 'Omnipotent Stress' or 'sphota' there is no manifestation, and because such stress remains in its pristine identity devoid of any manifestation or expression, it is indeterminate, for every determination is through Time. That which is in Time cannot describe or define what transcends Time, Mundane categories, as the German Philosopher, Immanuel Kant held, are not applicable to what transcends Time. In Śaivāgama, Time has been conceived of from the side of experience as the dynamic power 'Vimarṣa Śakti' in absolute Consciousness i.e. the power in absolute Consciousness for self-expression, self-manifestation or self-projection. Time is also regarded as the form and potency of all objectification into material facts. Time has thus a two-fold aspect—static and dynamic. In the static aspect, it lies identified with Absolute Consciousness as a mere 'stress' or 'Spandan' which changelessly endures, but in its kinetic creative aspect it bifurcates itself from Absolute Consciousness which polarises itself into 'Aham' and 'Idam'—'I' and 'This' forming the two poles of one Absolute unitary Consciousness manifested through Time. Due to this polarisation through Time, Consciousness manifests itself into the knower, knowledge and the known, 'pramātri'

'pramāṇa' and 'prameya'. This is known as creative ideation or 'Sṛṣtikalpanā'. Thus the Absolute is polarised through Time into the duality of subject and object. These two poles form a continuum holding 'Aham-Idam' as inseparable entities. But 'I'—'this' continum has a tendency to overcome the duality of subject and object and ultimately 'Aham' and Idam' merge into each other which is Time in its static aspect. Just as the circle evolves out of the centre, so out of this static State, due to inherent dynamism, Time which lies identified with the Absolute manifests the world of individual objects. Objectively viewed Time is the cosmic energy or 'Sakti' in which all other cosmic forces lie hidden. This cosmic energy in its totality is a mere stress or Spanda. In its dynamic aspect it realises itself in and through individual things and events. Hence every particular event or thing is a configuration or moment in Eternity. From gross physical things to atoms, electrons and ions all are particularised mutations of this Universal primordial Energy. The first aspect of this Universal 'Śakti' is the causal aspect, and cause can be viewed under three aspects. It is the self-same first cause 'Ādyā' which when manifested in creation is known as 'Brahmānī'' or "Brahma-Śakti", when manifested in preservation is known as "Vaiṣṇavī" or 'Vaiṣnavī Śakti', and when manifested in destruction is known as 'Rudrāṇi or Rudra Śakti'. Now, all evolution is from homogeneity to hetrogeneity. Out of this primordial 'Śakti' which is 'Time' the Universe evolves and is again dissolved back into this source from which it emanates. This process of evolution and involution, 'Āvirbhāva' and 'Tirobhāva', 'expansion' and

'contraction'. 'Nimeṣa' and 'Unmeṣa' form the two poles of one and the same reality viz. Time-power. From the standpoint of Śaivāgama Time is the 'Śakti' of the Absolute Consciousness which is 'Paramaśiva'. In other words, Śiva and Śakti are inseparably associated with each other, i.e., the ultimate Reality which is Pure Consciousness is always charged with power 'Saṇtata Samavāyinī'. Śiva is the Positive side and 'Śakti' being the negative side of the totality of Absolute Reality, the function of 'Śakti' or power is negation—'Niṣedhavyapararūpāśaktih'. All these powers of Creation, preservation and destruction are merely three distinct stages in the life of one Universal Time-Power. Thus Time subjectively viewed appears as Consciousness and objectively viewed as the 'Sakti' or power of Consciousness. It is evident that before all creation, preservation or destruction, Time remains identified in one Absolute Consciousness. Thus before anything comes into existence, before there is any manifestation, it cannot be determined by any adjective, but with the emergence of Time out of this indeterminate Absolute Consciousness the mighty surge of Eternity takes place.

The problem that arises here "what is the factor or instrumental cause of this bifurcation of Time-power from the Absolute Consciousness". According to the ancient Grammarians, evolution is an eternal process. It is not by a fiat of imagination nor as an accident that creation takes place at some particular point of Time, as some thinkers hold. This theory makes Absolute and the Universe two distinct realities having no relation with each other.

The Absolute is thus negated by the Universe and thus becomes a limited Absolute which is philosophically absurd. But if creation is conceived of as the continuous self-projection or 'self-ingression' of Absolute Consciousness in and through Time-power such a self-contradiction does not arise at all. (Niṣedha Vyapararūpā Śaktiḥ). This creation has neither beginning nor end; for expression and reality are not two, but two in one. But if creation is Eternal, the will-to-create both in the Universal and in the individual is also Eternal. Now the, nature of will has the tendency to fulfil itself. This tendency to fulfilment or realisation in individuals creates a disturbance in the perfect equipoise of Absolute consciousness. As a result, Time-power emerges out of its latent stage and its unfolding, unrolling process begins. Here creation or the unrolling process of the universe is not the result of any external necessity to be fulfilled. Creation thus is due to inherent immanent teleology or 'spanda' or stress which realises itself in through various states. Just as a child plays being impelled not by any outward necessity, but out of the fulness of life and joy within, similarly, creation proceeds out of the driving urge as self-expression (ullāsa) of Absolute Consciousness '(Lilabattu Proyajanam)'. When Time-power emerges, all movements or energisations proceed and movements are actuated by will-power. When Time-power is actuated by Will-power, there is a stress or 'spandan' in Absolute Consciousness and this is life. Life emerges out of Time-power. Thus we see that Time, as conceived in Śaivāgama, and in ancient Grammar, is regarded as the inalienable

dynamic power inherent in Absolute Consciousness. In its static aspect, it remains merged in absolute Consciousness, in its dynamic aspect, it bifurcates itself in and through space, it finds concretion in particular objects and persons. Where there is no time, there is no change, no going forth into a world of objects.

CHAPTER V.

THE FOUR STAGES OF THE 'LOGOS' OR THE ABSOLUTE

This chapter begins with one of the greatest sayings of Acharya Bhartṛihari 'Vaikharyyamadhamāyāsca pásyantyāscaitadadbhūtam. Anekatirtha bhedāyāstraiya vācaḥ paraṃ padaṃ Vakyapadiya, Canto 1, Karika 143.

What the above mentioned Karikā implies is that absolute Vāk or 'Logos' unfolds intself in and through three stages : (1) the supreme Parā or the subtlest, (2) the subtle sukshmā and (3) gross, Sthula. The highest or the Absolute Vāk is the 'summum Genus' and is considered not to be the subject matter of grammar. For the Absolute is beyond Pratya or mental apprehension. Therefore according to the above Karika only Vāk or the 'Logos' has its three distinct aspects namely Váikhari Vāk, Madhyamā Vāk and Páshyanti Vāk which constitute the subject matter of grammar. In the transcendental quiescent stage 'Śabda' or Vāk, there is neither sound nor object-consciousness "Nirvishaya" nor mental apprehension or pratyaya. There is, therefore, neither name nor form. Thus it cannot be made the subject matter of grammar or analytical understanding. Now Āchārya Bhartṛihari has defined Vaikhari Vāk in the following way. Paraih sambedyaṃ yasyā Śrotraviṣayatvena pratiniyatam Śrutirūpam sā Vaikhari.

This means that spoken speech which is manifested to the ear by gross physical sound produced

by the impact of the vocal organs on the surrounding ether by means of effort is called Vaikhari Vāk. All articulate sounds which clearly manifest alphabets, all inarticulate sounds which do not explicitly manifest alphabets, such as the sounds of animals and birds and all other sounds of musical instruments which admit of infinite variety are known as Vaikhari Vāk, or Vāk in its gross stage. The Madhamā Vāk is the Mātrikā state or matrix of 'Sabda' as it exists in man prior to its gross manifestations as the Varnas or alphabets in spoken speech. It is not projected outward word or words but introspectively apprehended through the understanding. It is the fountainhead of all alphabets in their subtle forms in which these forms are distinguishable from one another as forming one whole. Madhamā tu antaḥ sannivésinī parihṛhīta Krameva Budhimātropādānā yā tu sūkṣmaprāṇavṛttānugata Krama Saṃhārabhāve'pi Vyakta Prāṇaparigrahaiva Keṣāñcit. 'Vyākapadiya'.

Āchārya Bhartṛihari then goes on to describe the nature and characteristics of Pashyanti Vāk which is 'Vāk' or the Absolute actually going forth or 'Ikshana' producing or manifesting. It is a mere 'stress', in which all gradations of alphabets are merged and which appears as the Synthesis of them all. It is the synthetic unity of sounds and meanings or objects. As knowledge and its objects are intrinsically related and they cannot be apprehended separately, similarly in this stage the Vāk and its meaning or object form an organic unity. In other words it is the state of Vāk in its synthetic synoptic aspect. Pratisaṃhṛta kramāsatyapyabhede samāviṣṭa

Kramaśaktiḥ paśyanti. This is the causal stress in which meaning or objects are apprehended through 'Śabda' or Vāk. Rūpādiṣu viṣayeṣu arvvāk darśanānām vikṣiptā utpadyate buddhirvāgeva hi sā. Further this is the stage of trance in which a yogi realises his unity with the Absolute. Visuddha ca iti vākyogavidām, te hi tām akramām vācam vedayante apabhramśarvā viviktāma yathā vaiyakaraṇāḥ. In the fourth place, it has been enjoined by the ancient Grammarians that Pashyanti Vāk constitutes the synthetic aspect of the universe of objects. Here all objectifications or external projections are merged into the Absolute though not wholly dissolved. This has been very well said by the Cryptic phrase 'Samāviṣṭajneyakārā'. It is the form and potency of all creative urge. It being the Absolute as a concrete dynamic Reality has the subtlest form and hence almost indeterminate. It is the synthetic dynamic Consciousness in which all contradictions and distinctions are reconciled. "Antabhāvanivāpanno yaḥ kraṭuh sabdasamñjakaḥ Vṛthistasya Kriyārūpāma bhāgaśo bhajate kramam".

As a peacock's egg presents a synthesis of various filaments colour, and organs in their potential subtle forms and at the same time such potency is a becoming, similarly Pashyanti Vāk is the stage of synthetic unity of all diversifications out of which all such diversifications emerge in a state of continuous appearance and disappearance. Let us make the point clear with reference to a concrete example. Take the example of a person intending to speak out something. In the first place the 'Will-to-speak' activises all other bodily and mental efforts which

enable him to speak out something. But this first urge to speak is one with an inward sound in subtlest form which gradually unfolds itself into so many audible sounds. This primordial causal stress actually going forth in the form of subtle inward sound is the Pashyanti Vāk, the form and potency, the 'Nisus', the informing spirit of its evolutionary process in which the universe of meaning or objects unfolds itself from the subtlest to the grossest forms. The one synthetic 'word' or Vāk bifurcates itself into an infinite variety of sounds. It represents a 'garland of letters' which is the Veda. It reveals both the unified and the diversified aspects of the Absolute Reality. This is the first causal stress, a tension in the process of becoming. 'Ekasya sarvvabījasya yasya ceyamanekadhā bhoktṛbhoktavyarūpena bhogarūpena Ca Sthitiḥ'. —Vyakyapadiya.

It means that this 'Pashyanti Vāk' gradually goes forth out there into the world of finite subjects and the world of finite objects and all kinds of relations between the two. In its grossest form, it becomes the external world of objective facts. It is at once the synthetic potency or the fountainhead of all alphabets, of all sounds in their subtlest forms as well as the causal stress of all motion, energy, force or power. In this way this Pashyanti Vāk or Vāk in its most synthetic potentiality inspired by 'will-to-speak' gradually unfolds itself through letters, words and sounds, reaches its Madhamā State and finally through the auditory sense and the etherial region takes the form of audible sound or Baikhari Vāk. In fact the whole process of evolution is represented by Pashyanti Vāk which proceeds from a

state of homogeneity to the stage of heterogeneity. This is the process through which sounds reveal alphabets and their meanings. It forms a continuum of levels which are distinct though not separate; for distinction does not mean absolute separation.

A comparative estimate of the view herein arrived at by the ancient grammarians, specially Āchārya Bhartṛihari and the philosophy of Saivāgama reveals a close affinity of thought between the two systems of philosophy. This is so, because of the fact that Shree Acharya Bhartṛihari was deeply absorbed in Shaiva cult. The special point to be noted here is that the Pashyanti Vāk and 'Sadāshiva tattva' as enjoined in Shaivāgama stands for the same metaphysical reality. The 'Tattwa Prākasha' by Shree Bhojarāja describes the 'Sadāshaiva Tattwa' in the following aphorism—

Jñānakṛyākhyá-śaktorutkarṣa nikarṣayorabhāvena ya Prasarastam Prāhuḥ sadásivākhyaṃ budhāstattvam. Tattva-prakāśa Ch. II Verse 8

It means that the supreme Absolute Consciousness in its state of going forth out there as 'I-This' (Aham-Idam) remains as an equilibrium of the powers of (a) knowing pure and simple without any reference to emotional feeling or will, (b) the will-power or the power of feeling oneself as supersensible Consciousness and of an absolutely irresistible will, (c) As the pioneer of assuming any and every form that is created which is the 'Kriyā' Shakti of the Absolute. When the power of knowing remains

merged in Absolute Consciousness but there is 'Stress' or awakening of 'will-power' such state of the Absolute supreme consciousness is known as Sadāsiva Tattva. In the Siddhantahṛdya, we come across a similar argument, regarding Sadāsiva Tattva or trans-empirical Consciousness—Jñānakṛyākhyenyaktulye Śakti-cchodrekamasnute yadā sadāsivākhyastu tadāsau śivaḥ ucyate.' Kshemaraja, a disciple of Shree Abhinabaguptācharya in his famous commentary 'Iswarapratyavijnāhrdaya' also authoritatively mentions that the Paśhyanti Vāk indicates Śadāshiva Tattwa as established by Saiva Philosophy 'Śabdabrahmamayam paśyantirūpam ātmatattvamiti vaiyākaraṇāḥ Śrīsadāśivapadamadhyāsitāḥ'. Mātanga, the celebrated commentator in the following aphorism has tried to interpret the nature of Sadāshiva Tattwa as follows:—'Patyursaktiḥ parāsūkṣma jāgratodyotanakṣamātayā prabhuḥ prabhuddātmā svatantraḥ saḥ sadāśivaḥ.' This implies that Absolute Consciousness by virtue of its intrinsic dynamism in the state of feeling oneself as supersensible and of an absolutely irresistible will-power realises itself as a self-conscious dynamic person comprehending the entire universe with all its latent powers and forms as a single unitary principle. This independent power of actualisation or manifestation inherent as the intrinsic dynamism of the 'I' conciousness i.e. 'I' as the metaphysical subject is called Svatantra or free which is the limiting concept of all knowledge and activities and as such it comprehends all in its dynamic fulness. Thus Sadāshiva Tattwa is the trans-empirical Principle in which the self becomes aware of itself as a free soul (Pravuddhātmā) or awakened self.

In such a state the self realises its own intrinsic trans-empirical nature. This is the state of self-realisation. That is why this state is known as Pashyanti Vāk or the state in which the self perceives itself as a synthetic epitome of all that is. We are thus forced to the conclusion that the Pashyanti Vāk of ancient grammarians or Sadāshiva Tattwa of Shaivāgama indicates the same metaphysical reality as trans-empirical Consciousness. 'Sadāśivatattva ahantācchāditā sphutedantamayam yādṛśam parāpararūpam viśvam grāhyam tādṛgeva Śrī Sadāśivabhattārakādhiṣṭhito mantramaheśvarākhyaḥ pramātṛvargaḥ parameśvarecchāvakallpita tathāvasthānaḥ'. What the above commentary implies is that in the Sadāsiva Tattwa the all objectivity or 'This' remains merged in 'I-Consciousness', this is the unmanifested undifferentiated potentiality of all i.e., the mutual relation whether in manifestation or beyond it, whether as the Ideal universe is one of inseparable relation of inherence, such as that between 'I-Consciousness' or Ahantā and Idantā this-Consciousness. In it the Aham as the subject and the Idam as the object remain undifferentiated. Here the self enjoys itself not in the form of external object but as the aspect of consciousness or trans-empirical consciousness whose projection all objects are. The adjective (Samāvistajneyākārā) i.e. consciousness in its undifferentiated potentiality of all that is, is worthy of being mentioned here.

In this connction Kshemarāja, a disciple of Āchārya Abhinabagupta in his famous commentary (Pratyavijnahrdya) while commenting on the sūtra

'Tadvhumika sarvadarsanasthiya' has stated that the ancient Grammarians did admit that Pashyanti Vāk and sabda Brahma indicate the same transcendental metyphysical Reality or absolute Consciousness. Śabda brahmamayam pásyantirūpam ātmatattvamiti vaiyākaraṇāḥ Śrīsadāśivapadamadhyāsitāḥ (Pratyavijnahṛdyam) Following him, later commentators and many scholars quoting from the famous vākyapadiya the following lines have tried to support the above contention. Vaikharyyā madhyamāyāśca pasyantyāścaitadbhūtam Anekatirtha-bhedāyāstraiyāvācaḥ paraṃ padaṃ.

(Vakyapadiya Canto I).

It implies that the ancient Grammarians have admitted only Bhaikhari, Madhyamā and Pashyanti Vāk. In the above Kārika three kinds of Vāk have been mentioned, and it is generally presumed that the fourth or the absolutely treanscendental supreme Consciousness or Parā Vāk 'Logos' is not admitted by the ancient grammarians. Therefore the inevitable conclusion which follows is that the Sadāsiva Tattva of Shaivāgama and Pashyanti vāk of the ancients grammarians are identical reality. This is a moot point which requires further clarification.

It is to be admitted that Shree Āchārya Bhaṛtrihari while speaking of Sabda-Brahma did characterise the same as 'Anadinidham' which means nonrelational transcendental metaphysical Reality beyond all differentiations, beyoud the space-time continuum which is the universe or in other words all kinds of mutations or manifestations are totally absent. This is the stage in which the Idam or 'I'-

this consciousness' is not yet manifested. It is above and beyond space, beyond time and is the limiting concept of all knowledge and activities. But it is clearly evident that the ancient grammarians have characterised Pashyanti Vāk or 'I—this consciousness' in which the 'I' and the 'This' remain distinct yet forming one whole. In fact it is the synthetic trans-empirical consciousness in which there is distinction but no differentiation. All kinds of manifestations or mutations remain as forming a synthesis. Though in this stage the Jnāna Shakti or the power of knowing without any reference to emotional feeling or will or the Kriyā shakti or the power of self-manifestation remain in a state of equipoise, yet the Ichchhā shakti or the power of 'I'-consciousness or the power of feeling oneself as supremely able and of an irresistible Will remains awakened as immediate awareness. Such characterisation of Pashyanti Vāk by the ancient grammarians is a pointer to a supreme Reality in a state of potential manifestation, a stage out of which time-power has already emerged; for all expressions are actualised through time-power. Time reveals distinction and as there is distinction between the 'Ahantā' 'I' and 'This' or Idantā though undifferenciated, and as all dinstictions are temporal configurations of space-time, we are to admit that Pashyanti Vāk is not the supreme absolute transcendental Consciousness or Paravak which is the ideal or Summum Bonum of the Brahmakanda of the famous 'Vakyapadiya' of Shree Āchārya Bhṛtrihari. The first Karikā of the same text bears ample testimony to the same conclusion. "Anadinidhanaṃ Bṛahmá śabdatattvam yadakṣaram vivartate

arthabhāvena prakṛyājagato yataḥ''. It implies that the supreme Reality or sabdabrahman is the highest limit of all knowledge, of all manifestation, effort and perfection. There is nothing beyond it, when all manifestations cease or are annihilated it remains in its pristine absolute transcendence. It admits of no stage, for it is the end of all states. It does not merge itself into any other reality; for in it all manifestations are merged, that is why it is called 'Akshara' or unconditioned transcendental Reality to which the categories like space, time, causality substance etc. are not applicable. On the other hand Pashyanti Vāk implies the first stage or primitive flutter of the self-expression or self-ingression of the Absolute. The upanishadic aphorism 'Aham Prajāeyma', 'Aham Bhahushāyama' are clear enough pointers to this stage. More accurately the Brahman itself in the form of its power is in a stage of going forth (Prasarati). This is the stage of the union of Will and word Vāk or 'Logos'—the primitive Potency just on the threshold of actualising itself in the manifested universe. All these go to show that Pashyanti Vāk is not the highest limit, the unconditional non-relational Absolute Consciousness, but it indicates the first stage or potency of all manifestations. It definitely indicates a higher stage in which it ultimately merges itself which is the Para Vāk as established by Āchārya Bṛhtrihari. In the second place the words 'Arthabhavena Vivartate' is an admission of the fact that the supreme absolute Consciousness has both transcendental and immanent aspects. In its pure transcendental aspect, it is beyond the limits of time or space or form and as such it has no cause, and is eternal. In its imma-

nent aspect, it pervades the entire universe. Thus the self-same Absolute or Sabdabrahman which is beyond all manifestation becomes manifested into the experienced universe and experience itself. Here the ancient grammarians have used a technical term namely 'Vibarta' which requires some clarification here. What ,they mean by 'Vibarta' has been very well expressed in the following Kārika. 'Ekasya tattvāṭ apracyutasyabhedanukārenaasatyā vibhaktānyarūpakagrāhitā vivarttaḥ.' (Vākyapadiya, Canto I). What it implies is that the process known as 'Vibarta' means—that which is in reality one, yet appears as many and though appearing as many remains as the same undifferentiated self-identical non-relational Reality. Thus vivarta is applicable to all stages of manifestation, potential or kinetic but inapplicable to Sabdabrahman or the supreme Absolute Consciousness. Pashyanti Vāk is a stage indicating the state of Vivarta, for herein all 'this' 'Idantā' or manifestation remains as latent potential forces, i.e., it is the subtle state of all differentiations. But the aforesaid commentary is a clear enough pointer to the fact that in the highest stage of 'Sabdabrahman' there is no expression or manifestation of the 'Idanta' or the objective universe of things and meanings. The following text is quoted in support of this contention. 'Sūkṣmām arthenāprabhikta-tattvāmekām vācamanabhinisyandamānām utānye vidurasyāmiva ca pūtam enām nānārūpām ātmani sanniviṣṭām'. This text clearly indicates an absolutely non-relational transcendental Reality in which all differentiations remain in undistinguishable identity. In this connection it may be pointed

out that Achārya Bṛhtrihari in reverence to Shree Vyāsa's sutra 'Yanmādásya yataḥ' has used the words 'Prakryāyagatóyatāḥ', in other words, the supreme absolute transcendental Consciousness is the highest Reality in which there is no recognition of this' or 'Idantá' and which negates all mutations. This is the Reality which is beyond all form, all kinds of mental apprehensions or Artha and Pratya. Though it is manifested in the 'many', yet it is not the 'many'. This is the true innermost self in every being, a changeless Reality of the nature of a purely experiencing principle, (Chaitanyamātā—Shivasutravimarshinee—Sutra I) as distinguished from whatever may assume the form of either the experienced or the means of experience. There is in reality neither any object of experience nor means of experience. In its essence it is 'Absolute Experience' or the supreme self. It is the supreme Experiencing Principle itself that assumes the form of experience. While explaining the point further Āchārya Bṛhtrihari has made the following assertion 'Tataḥ evahi Śabdākhyādupasaṃhṛtakramād Brahmanaḥ sarvvavikāra-pratyastamaye saṃvarttādanākṛtat pūrvvam vikāragranthirūpatvenā vyapadésāt jagadākhyavikaraḥ prakṛyante.

(Vākyakpadiya).

The special point which is worthy of being mentioned here is that Acharya Vasugupta in his text 'The Shiva Sūtra Vimarshinī' which is an authoritative commentary on Kashimir Shaivism, has clearly acknowledged his unanimity in respect of the point under reference, that the self in its sup-

reme transcendental aspect is beyond Artha i.e., meaning or object, and Pratyaya or mental apprehension. This may be explained in the following way. To explain, an earthen pot is neither self-presentative 'Svātmani Na Chamatkṛate' nor is conscious of itself, 'Svātmā Na Parāmisyate' nor does it reveal itself to itself. 'Na Svātmani prakāśayate' nor does it appear without being limited 'Na Aparicchannyatayā Bhāsyate'. Hence it is called insentient in common parlance. On the other hand in the case of an individual person say 'Ram' there is self-presentation of the ego or 'I'—by virtue of its various activities like resolution, efforts, satisfaction etc. Ram is conscious of himself, he reveals himself to himself and is capable of contrasting himself to that which is in the nature of the object or the 'this' or 'Idantā' as such. He realises himself in and through the multifarious flux of changing appearances like the 'blue', the 'Yellow' 'pleasure', 'pain' and even without these as the same identical self. Hence the individual person 'Ram' is called self-conscious. It is to be noted here that the dualism in calling an individual person 'Ram' conscious of object or 'Idam' is apparent and purely a case of superimposition 'ārope' and hence illussory. Metaphysically speaking Reality or self is the absolute Consciousness and is one 'Chiṇṃātre tu Ātmāṇām Swavavadasya Aghatanāṭ......Cháitanyamekaivaṭmā' (Commentary on sutra I Shiva Sutra Vimarshiṇi by Kshemarāja). This 'I' as the transcendental metaphysical Reality is called Swatantra or absolutely free or non-relational transcendental Reality. This is the 'Paramashiva' Tattva of Shaivāgama. Accord-

ing to this view Consciousness or 'Chiti' is one and indivisible and is directly opposed to all dualism. For, if the nature of Consciousness admits of variety, it becomes synonymous with insentient inert object like jars, pictures etc. Further if we admit any dualism in it in terms of space and time, then such space and time being different from Consciousness will remain unmanifested and as such will be unreal; for Consciousness is the one self-manifesting Reality-principle admitted here. If, however, such space, time be manifested, they cannot be different from Consciousness, so there can be no dualism in consciousness. If again Consciousness be regarded as without intrinsic dynamism of self-presentative character, 'Pratyava-marsha', any dualism in the nature of consciousness becomes all the more absurd 'Chinmātre tu Ātmanām Swavāvavedasya aghatanāṭ. The apparent dualism in the 'I'—consciousness' has been accounted for in Shaiva Siddhanta by the presence of 'Mala' or limiting conditions in individual selves in bondage. Although there are limiting conditions before liberation, they vanish altogether at the stage of liberation and as such there cannot be any multiplicity or limiting principle in the self. If again, for the sake of argument, it is held that with the cessation of 'malas' or limiting conditions there remains some distinction between the liberated self and 'Parama Shiva' or the Supreme transcendental Consciousness as the ultimate Reality—principle; our rejoinder in such a hypothetical case will be that such liberated self will fall in the category of 'Jiva' or the empirical self however elevated. Really speaking, in the stage of liberation all such

talks about distinction in terms of inferiority are irrelevant. A comparative study of the philosophy of ancient grammarians and Kashmir Shaivism clearly reveals a type of non-dualistic system of philosophy whose beginning can be traced in Vedic revelations. In the Rig Veda it has been enjoined "Vāk is one with Brahman". In the Brihadāranyaka it is said "By Vāk, O Monarch! the Brahman is known', Vāk is the supreme Brahman "Vāchaiva Saṃrāḍ Brahmajnāyate Vāg Vai Samrāt Paramam Brahma". The shatapatha Brāhmana says "Vāg Vái Ajo Vācho Vai Prajāh Vishvakarmā jajanā". What it means is that Vāk or the 'Logos' is the unborn. It was from Vāk that the 'Demiargus' proceeds in the act of creation. It is a Hindu belief and immemorial tradition that before manifestation, all sāstras or religious scriptures which are but thoughts translated into speech, like the manifested universe itself form the object or Artha or meaning of speech and exists through all eternity in the yet unexpressed thought and experience of the Supreme Deity in the form of the All transcending Vāk. That is the Parā Vāk which is beyond all objective thought and speech in all their forms and manifoldness. The 'Parā Vāni' or the all transcending 'Logos' of the ancient grammarians and the Parama-Shiva Tattva or the absolutely supreme Consciousness represent the same ultimate metaphysical Reality which is the true nature of the self in its pristine glory. The next higher stage is characterised by the stage of self-revelation or self-ingression whereby Parama Shiva or Parā Vāk, the all-Transcending Logos or 'Word' also begins to manifest itself in the form of that thought and experience which would

hold, as it were, in an all comprehensive vision the whole universe which is to be and which is still in a very subtle undifferentiated state, so that it cannot yet be thought of, much less spoken of as 'This'. In other words, the Parā Vāk assumes another form, that is, the form of the 'Pasyanti', which is the all-comprehensive vision 'Sub specie aeternitatis' and is the same trans-empirical Reality known as Sadā Shiva Tattva in Saiva Philosophy. Further, as there is progress in the unfolding process of the mighty surge of Eternity, it contains all the form, the objects of analytical thought and experience,—as they become distinguishable from one another as 'This' or 'That', what was the all-comprehensive vision, the 'Pashyanti Vāk' assumes a next stage in the heirarchy of Reality, the 'Madhyamā Vāk' or 'Hiranya-garbha Shabda' as enjoined in the Vedas, which is the Matrikā state of Shabda or 'Logos' as it exists in beings prior to their gross manifestation as the Varnas or alphabets in spoken speech and which forms, as it were, a link between the undifferentiated subtle 'Pashyanti Vāk' and the spoken word 'Vaikhari Vāk', which is but thought and experience expressed by means of vocal organ. The cardinal point to be remembered here is what is called Suddha-vidyā Tattwa in saivāgama is nothing but this Madhyamā Vāk assuming these forms and 'gushing forth' into the Vaikhari or spoken words in five torrential currents from what has been enjoined as the five faces of Shiva. These five Faces represent the five aspects of the glory and power of Parama-Shiva namely (1) the aspect of Chit or Chit Shakti or the pure light of Consciousness as it is in itself, The sup-

reme self-conscious, self-luminous Principle when there is nothing to shine upon (2) The Ānanda Sakti or the power of realising absolute Bliss or Ecstasy which is ever perfect in itself irrespective of any need for any outward object and means and irrespective of emerging out of itself for its satisfaction and which is therefore ever independent and is ever at rest as a continuum of undisturbed peace, (3) The Ichhā-sakti or the Will-power of feeling oneself as the supreme omnipotent Being and possessed of absolutely irresistible Will (4) The Jnana-Sakti or the power of knowing pure and simple without any content i.e. without any reference to emotional feeling or Will. Achārya Avinavagupta in his Tantra-sāra says 'Āmarshātmakata jnānasakti'. By 'Amarsha' here is meant just the immediate awareness of objectivity as a mere presentation without any tendency of going out towards it i.e. without reacting upon it by way of interpretation or assimilation, (5) The Kriyā-sakti or the power of manifestation in any form. 'Sarvākāroyogittaṃ Kriyāsaktiḥ' Pratyabhijnā-Hṛidaya (see 2) i.e. the power of assuming any and every form. It is evident that according to Saiva philosophy the ultimate Reality or 'Parama Shiva' or the supreme Light of Consciousness is not an abstraction, not a mere 'that' apart from its 'what', not a powerless, featureless, contentless substance, but is a self-conscious, self-luminous spiritual principle embodying in itself both a transcedent as well as an immanent aspect. Kshemaraja in his 'Pratyabhijnā Hṛidaya' says "Sreemaḍ Paramashivasya Punaḥ Biswottirnabiswātmaka-paramānandamayaprakasasaikāghanasya...... akhilaṃ avedenaiva sphurati, na tu bastutaḥ anvaṭ

kinchiṭ grāhyaṃ grāhakaṃ vā; api tu Sreepramashiva Bhattāraka eva itthaṃ nānāvaiśchitrasahasraiḥ sphurati". In other words the Supreme Light of absolute Consciousness has a twofold aspect. He is the highest transcendental Principle who ever persists as the self-identical ultimate Reality without in any way being affected by the manifestation of His own powers and glories. In His immanent aspect, He is the universe manifested in His own powers and glories. Thus there is nothing extraneous to affect His nature in any way. The universe which is nothing but an infinite centres of powers is but the self-expansion of the same spiritual principle who is Parama Siva. It is thus evident that Absolute Consciousness is a dynamic spiritual principle which alternately and eternally goes forth into a phase of manifestation, or self-expansion (unmishati) and a phase of envelopment, self-contraction (nimishati). Creation, therefore, according to Saivāgama is the continuous process of self-manifestation and self-contraction of the absolute Consciousness. Each state of self-expansion and self-contraction together constitutes a moment in Eternity and each moment represents a 'Kalpa' i.e. the process of imagining or ideating a creation and a dissolution which forms a continuum with an infinite number of Kalpas. Creation being an eternal process having neither beginning nor end, the countless universes in the eternal past, the present and the eternal future universes form a continuum forming a series in which they are linked together by the relation of causal necessity. In other words each successive universe comes into being as the inevitable sequence

of certain causes generated in the one preceding it. Strangely enough this view of Saiva philosophy has been echoed in modern physics. Sir Arthur Eddington says "In ordinary and primary physics which knows nothing of time's arrow, there is no discrimination of cause and effect, but events are connected by a symmetrical relation which is viewed from either end". Modern physics, in course of its analysis of the physical world holds the view that it is beginningless as well as endless series of events in which there is no time-interval; for this universe is not Static but dynamic flow of events. The aforesaid five aspects have been called Īshana, Tatpurasha, Sadyojāta, Aghora and Vamadeva. The Shaiva philosophies which issued forth from the five-fold faces of the Deity consisted of many systems of which one hundred and ninety two systems spread all over India, but with the growing influence of the Kali Age and the gradual disappearance of Rishis or seers and Achāryas, our Shāstras are gradually being enveloped in the darkness of ignorance and are still little known and studied with the reverence and 'reasoned reflection' which they deserve. Be that what it may, it is a fact beyond dispute that the conclusions of Shaiva philosophy have close resemblance to those arrived at by ancient grammarians. That Shree Acharya Bhaṛtrihari was himself a Shaiva philosopher has been clearly established by historians and commentators. The acharyas of Tantrashāstra have also definitely confirmed the view that the Parā Vāk is synonymous with the supreme light of pure Consciousness. This also shows unanimity between the acharyas of Tantrashāstras and ancient grammars. The following

extract from Sarada Tilaka Tantra is an evidence in point. 'Bhidamānāt parāvindorayaktātmāravo'' Śabdabrahmeti tam prāhuh sarvvagamā viśāradāh.. Sabdabrahmeti śabdārtham śabdamityaparḥ Jaguḥ Chaitayam Sarvvabhūtāñam sabdabrahmeti me matiḥ taṭ prāpya kundalirūpam prāninām dehamadhyagām.

Sāradātīlaka Tantrām Prathama Patala I

In other words, that indeterminate word or 'Logos' which shines forth out of the first causal state (Karanavindu) has been celebrated by the acharyas of Tantra philosophies as Sabda Brahman. This indeterminate 'Logos' is the transcendent-immanent Supreme Consciousness pervading the entire universe of inorganic and organic forms. Though it pervades the entire universe of things, it is specially manifested in the body of living animals. This subtlest indeterminate sphota or 'Logos' is nothing but absolute light of Consciousness. Acharya Shankara in his famous philosophy, 'Prapanchasāra Tantra' holds the same view in definitely asserting the absolute 'Logos' as Parā Vāk. "Vindo tasmāt bhidyamānāt ravo'vyaktātmako-'bhavat sah evo Śrutisampannaiḥ sabdabrahme'ti gīyate." (Prapānchasara Patala I, Verse 43). In other words the great magnificent 'sound' or 'Logos' which emerges when the 'Vindu', the form and potency of all creative powers splits is known as Sabdā Brahman. The supreme Transcendental 'Nāda' implies the supracausal or Mahākārana state of the absolute Light of Consciousness or Brahman. This 'Nāda' comprises within itself all distinct and indistinct sounds of all letters, and

alphabets; as the Sun comprehends within its womb all the variegated colours and rays. In the Sarada Tilaka Tantra it has been described as the absolute 'Logos' permeating the Vedas, the Mantras, the fundamental principles or Tattvas comprehending everything and is identical with Sabda Brahman. 'Ādhāré sarvvabhūtānām sphurantī vidyudākṛtiḥ śaṅkhāvarttākramāddevi sarvvamāvṛtya tiṣhhati kundalibhūta sarpānām aṅgaśriyamupeyasī. Sarvvavedamayī devi sarvvamantramayī Śivā sarvvatattvamayī sākṣat sūkṣmāt suksmātarā Vibhuḥ Tridhama jananī devī, sabda-brahma svarupinī

(Saradatilaka, I Patala).

In other words, the Supreme Absolute Consciousness is the 'Logos', is no other than the self-conscious self-luminous spiritual Principle which pervades the entire universe and which is manifested through various stages of matter, life and mind. She is the quintessence of the vedas, the matrix of all mystic syllables and alphabets and subtlest source of all gross manifestations.

In this context it is to be noted that the supreme light of pure Consciousness or Parā Saṃviṭ or Paramashiva has a special significance in Āgamasastras quite different from what is generally understood by the term 'Consciousness' in Western philosophy. In the West consciousness was formerly regarded as a kind of function of the brain-process or one of the special functions of the mind. To them mind and consciousness are synonymous. 'Consciousness' was used in the limited, personal sense of the mind's direct cognizance of its own states and processes,

the perception of what passes in one's own individual mind. But lately western psychologists are thinking that there is a consciousness wider and deeper than the cerebral consciousness. They are gradually becoming aware of a sub-liminal or sub-consciousness besides consciousness and non-consciousness. They again mistake sub-consciousness as the most important and vital part of our mental, moral and spiritual being. They have not yet been able to grasp the true significance and import of the term 'trans-empirical absolute Consciousness'. According to Saivāgama, this 'trans-empirical Absolute Consciousness' is the ultimate Reality manifested in different forms and expressed by different names. It is the supreme principle of the universe, the Light that pervades everything, the Life that permeates everything, the Reality of all that is real. As such it is originally universal, all-pervading, all-comprehending ultimate Reality. In other words, it is omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent. In the 'Rig-veda' it has been called "Rita-Cit". As the underlying all-comprehending Reality in every being of the universe, 'Parā-Samvit' or 'Chit' is one and the same identical principle in them all, indivisible, unconditioned by any of them, however much they be separated either in space or in time as particulars. Thus it is evident that if we are to use the term 'Consciousness' for 'Chit', it must be understood in a context quite different from that of Western psychology and philosophy. Moreover it is to be noted that in ordinary parlance by 'consciousness' we mean some phenomenon manifested and therefore limited in time and space and conditioned by

our finite experience. But the Absolute as 'Chit' is the substratum of all i.e. 'Chit-Swarupa' or 'Chit' as it is in itself is nothing particular and conditioned. Further this Light of Absolute Consciousness is not to be identified with dreaming, nor it can be identified with the state of profoundly dreamless sleep. These are all phenomenal states, 'Chitta-vritti' in which experience fluctuates. But 'Chiti' or parā-Samviṭ never varies, nor disappears in any of those fluctuating states but remains eternally one and the same identical Reality. Still less can we identify 'Chit' with mere 'awareness'. In fact 'mere awareness' is a state of 'Chit' obscured by its own Māyā-sakti projected out there as mere awareness. According to Āgama sāstras the supreme Reality called saṃviṭ is of the nature of pure light of transcendental 'Chit' or Consciousness. It is also called Parāsamvit, the Supreme Experience, Parameshvara, the Supreme Lord, or Paramashiva, the supreme Shiva. It is the innermost self in every being not only as Experiencing Being but also everything else in the universe, both separately as well as the entire universe as a whole. This supreme principle is beyond the limits of time, space and form and as such is eternal and infinite. This absolute light of pure consciousness is self-luminous, that is, it shines forth out of its own intrinsic light. It is infinite light called 'Prakāsa' with an unrestricted irresitible free will called 'Vimarsā' or 'Svatantrya'. This irresitible freedom constitutes its essense or Power which is intrinsically involved in it and remains ever identical with its being. 'Parāsaktirúpā Chitireva Bhagobato...... Shivavattārakābhinnā'—'Pratyabhijnabrdaya.' Samviṭ or the transcendent Paramashiva is all perfect

in himself 'Purnāhantā' in whom the universe of subject and object remains dissolved in the form of discursive thought and speech, He holds the universe in his Womb as an 'Amarshaparanādagarva'. There is as yet no experience of 'Time', no experience of 'before' or 'after'. For a succession of movements in Eternity is experienced only with the manifestation of Kālasakti. It is free from Vikalpas. It is one, being integral, pure in essence, devoid of any dualism. Being irresitible free will, it does not depend on anything for its self-projection and function. It shines forth out of its own fulness of light and Power. This power of shining forth or self-projection is called 'Svātaṇtrya' or 'Māyāsakti'. In other words, this one absolute Light of Consciousness, the true innermost self, the transcendental supreme Experience become manifested into an infinite variety of world-systems not by the impact of any external necessity, but out of the fulness of joy within which is identical with it and which constitutes its intrinsic dynamism 'sphota' or Spanda. It has been compared to a transparent mirror, within which the universe shines as an image inseparable and indistinguishable from it. It is to be noted here that a mirror reflects an object or manifests an object not by itself but by the power of an external light, but the supreme light of self-luminous Consciousness in its fulness of power and intrinsic dynamism manifests the universe. But in the process of manifesting it remains always the same identical Being, just as the mirror remains a mirror in spite of the variety of images. Sreemaṭ paramasivashya punaḥ Biswottirna-biswātmaka-paramānandamayo-prakasaikaghanashya. . akhilam ave-

denaiva sphurati; na tu bastutaḥ Anvaṭ kinchiṭ grāhyam grāhakam va ; api tu sree paramasivavattāraka eva íthan nānā vaíchitrasahasrena sphurati.

Pratyavignahṛiday. P. 8.

The special point to be noted here with regard to Parāsamvit is that it admits of levels or stages in the process of self-manifestation. There are thus three possible Phases which are to be clearly explained; (1) Parāsamvit in its Pristine transcendence without the world being manifested within it. 'Akulaswarūpa purnāhantā chit-chaitanyamātmā'—Sivasūtra-Vimorshiní. I (ii) Parā samvit with the world being manifested within its womb as an 'idea' without any exteınal projection. That is Parā-Samvit as a stress in which 'Ānandasakti' is just awakened. (iii) Parā samvit experiencing the world within it as an 'idea along with its projection outside. That is Parā samvit in which the irresitible 'will-power' has been actualised. The special point to be noted here is that in spite of its aspects or levels of being, Parā samvit remains the same identical Reality and is in no way affected, hence it is free from 'Vikalpa' or any kind of modification. This is the state in which the śwatantra or the irresitible free power of unfolding itself remains latent within it. It illumines itself, as it were, by its own intrinsic light, even when there is nothing to illumine. This stage may be compared to the Sun as if shining by itself even when there is no object which it might light up or manifest. This is the stage of 'chitswarupa' the changeless principle of all our changing experience and the ever changing experienced. In the

Barāha Upanishada it has been described as 'the Reality which remains after all thoughts subside'. In other words, logical thought being inherently dualistic presupposes a distinction between subject and object, between self and not-self. But in absolute transcendental Consciousness there is no such distinction as yet, that is why it transcends all thought. In other words, Consciousness is an eternal Reality which persists through object-consciousness. This absolute Light of consciousness is neither subjective nor objective, though it is the form and potency of the subjective as well as the objective. In that ultimate foundation of experience which is the 'Parā-Samvit' all dualism and even duality vanishes. The logician may ask what is the evidence of the 'being' of such an unaffected Light of Consciousness. Modern psychology which deals with changing states of experience cannot bear any testimony to its being. It may be said, however, that if we have experience of the relative we can transcend the relativity in the widest context of the absolute Experience. The psychologist will say that we have no such experience of consciousness without any direction or form. It must be mentioned here that according to Āgamasāstra the pure Light of Consciousness not only is but also is the one ultimate eternal Reality. They do not regard 'chit' as a mere mode 'chitta Vritti' or function, or epiphenomenon but regards it as the plenum which is the indwelling informing spiritual principle in all, which is the very foundation of all forms and modes of fleeting experience, whether of sensation, instinct, will, understanding, reasoning etc. It is the unchanging spiritual principle shining forth into the variety of changing forms out of the

fulness of joy within. Since all conception or volition or feeling are essentially apparent circumscription or self-limitation of the one 'Saṭ' or ultimate Being, it is the all comprehensive totality of all Experience without any name of form, devoid of any kind of determination, a state of absolute quiescence 'Sūnāyatisūnnya' Pratyavigma Hridya Page 8.9. Zero or 'Infinitv' a state of mere tension without any manifestation which may at ence start even when the slightest construction is put upon it resulting in a state of 'I'—this—Consciousness'. Thus the supreme form of consciousness or Parāsakti is not the consciousness of anything particular though it is parāsakti of everything particular, yet it is not to be confounded with no Experience. We do so because our living on this planet called the earth is pragmatic and all our interest rests on particular modes of awareness. To the ordinary man, pure unconditioned Absolute Experience or 'Chit' in which there is nothing particular to obtain or to avoid, to love or to hate appears practically to be no experience at all, but pure consciousness is impartial, that is, not anything particular, there is in it no difference or discrimination. It is pure Consciousness as such without any mode whatsoever. It is alogical absolute quiescent Consciousness, is pure undifferentiated totality of Experience with no special subjective direction, reference and interest, with no difference of level. It is the pure Experiencing principle as distinguished from whatever may assume the form of either the experience or of the means of experience. In our every day life by necessity we crave for modes and forms, we are interested in what is limited. It is supposed that pluralistic variety and polarity

are necessary for enjoyment. Hence we form the habit of associating all knowledge and existence with variety and change. We scheme over the surface of thing, we do not try to penetrate deeper into the abysmal depth of reality, we ignore the unfathomed depth where there is absolute quiescence which is the Supreme Bliss (Paramānanda) and Supreme peace (Shānta). The Brihadāranyaka Upanishad says 'other beings live on a fraction of the great Bliss. This self-luminous absolute Light of pure consciousness being a sumnum genus term cannot be logically defined, nor can be known through the sāstras, for how can that which is self-shining, self-revealing be illumined by the Sāstras ? Thus the Āgama sāstras say that it is self-existent (Nirādhārā), Eternal (Nitya) unchanging (Avikari) undifferentiated (Abhinna), beyond space (Pūrna) beyond time (Shāsvata) all pervading (sarvagata), self luminous (Svayamjyotih), pure (Chit). As Kulārnava Tantra says (Chapter I, sloke 6-7) "Shiva is the supreme Reality or Brahman, the all-knowing Creator of all, He is stainless One and Lord of all. He is One without a second, he changes not and is without beginning or end. He is without any attribute and is the highest. He is 'Sat Swarūpa' that is, He is Being pure consciousness, chit swarūpa and perfect bliss Ananda Swarūpa. As Sat it is the unity of being beyond any particularity, i.e. beyond the opposites of 'This or That', 'When' and 'Where', 'here and there', 'before and after', as an integral synthetic Experience, i.e. as Chit, it is beyond the opposites of knowledge and ignorance. As supreme Bliss or Paramānanda, it is realised when there is complete cessation of all dualism lead-

ing to happiness and sorrow. Ultimate Being or reality or Saṭ is an undifferentiated unity which is admitted as 'Niskala', supreme Experience or absolute consciousness i.e. Chit as immediacy of Experience in which there is neither any experience nor the means of experience. It is, in short, the innermost Self in every being, of the nature of a purely experiencing principle Chaitanyamātmā' ('Shiva sutra Bimarshinī'.) Though it comprehends all relations, in itself it is neither a relation nor a totality of relations but a completely relationless self-identical spiritual principle unknowable by any logical process whatsoever. This Parā samvit or Chit is the plenum, is not a finished or finite product but an absolute partless continuum; for production and destruction involve the existence, bringing together and separation of parts respectively. It is necessary as it is in itself i.e. as Chit in a state of perfect equipoise, for no parts of an all pervading partless continuum can move from one place to another. When the being of anything is asserted the 'Sat' or 'Being' is confirmed. From all this, it is evident that according to Āgama Sāstras Chit, samvit or absolute Light of pure Consciousness is the highest Reality or is the innermost perfect Self beyond the manifested universe of space, time and causality and is of the nature of self-luminous, self-conscious Light. By a strange coincidence of history, the same conclusion has been confirmed by the ancient grammarians specially by Acharya Bhartrihari in his conception of Parā Vāc as Éternal, unconditioned, non-relational Ultimate Reality. I have already clearly tried to establish the point that in spite of the saying that Pashyanti, Madhyamā and Baikhari

are the proper subject matters of ancient grammar 'Traiāvāchāparampada', the Parā Vāc constitutes the summum Bonum, the Ens realisimum of ancient grammarians. For the three kinds of 'Vani' Pashyanti, Madhymā and Baikhari are distinct, yet inseparable aspects or levels of the Parā Vāk. This is clearly established by the aphorism "Anadinidhanaṃ Bhrahma Śabdatattvaṃyadakṣaram Vivarttate arthabhāvena pṛakṛyāyagato yatah" Vyakapadiya 'Brahmakanda'. Thus we are irresistibly and inevitably led to conclude, in the face of such important evidences that Parā samvit or Paramashiva Tattva or absolute Light of pure consciousness as established by Āgama sastras indicates the same supreme transcendental Reality otherwise known as Parā Vāk or sabda 'Brahman Tattava' established by the Acharyas of the ancient grammar.

PARĀ SAMVIT IN ITS IMMANENT ASPECT.

It has already been pointed out that Parama Shiva or Parā samvit is beyond the experienced, beyond all means of experience. It is, in fact, beyond the limits of time, space and form and is purely a transcendental, non-relational spiritual principle. It is a fact that creation of the universe is a 'Vikalpa' which is admitted by Āgama sāstras as well as by the ancient grammarians. But the moot problem that arises is 'how can creation as a 'Vikalpa', emerge from the pure Light of Absolute Consciousness or 'Samvit' which is free from Vikalpas. According to vedānta the supreme Bhramhan or Absolute, is pure 'Jnanaṃ' without the slightest

stress of either actual or potential objectivity. Creation does not emerge out of the Absolute, it is only an aspect, beginningless process, though such a process is cyclic in nature going on in the realm of 'Māyā, 'Nescience as superimposed on Bhraman which reveals it. It is a process which is not in any way initiated by Bhrahman. Thus the notion of Creation by Brahman is as much 'Māyā' as the notion of the world created. The Acharyas of Āgama sāstras, however, hold a different view. According to them the Absolute is not merely Absolute, it is not a static, formless, contentless, featureless logical abstraction. But a concrete, dynamic, self-conscious, self-luminous Absolute, whose indwelling informing essence is 'Svatantra or the irresistible Will-power intrinsic in the Parā samvit or the Absolute to generate movement. 'Maya' is not a third principle, a 'tertium quid' nor a non-conscious principle but is the Vimarsa-sakti which remains dissolved in Prakāsa or the self-luminous Absolute consciousness (Antārlīna Vimarsa). The universe remains latent within this power and this power which is Vimarsa sakti is within the Absolute. In Āgama sāstra Sakti has been called the principle of Negation 'Nishedhavyāpārarūpa Saktiḥ'. Thus Māyā-sakti is the same Light of pure Consciousness veiling itself. This samvit is Prakāsa self-luminous as well as Vimarsa, self-conscious. It is beyond the universe (Viśvottirna) and yet immanent (Visvātmika). These two aspects constitute one integral 'whole'. Therefore, there is a real creation and a real nexus between the Absolute and the universe. Thus Parā samvit sccording to Āgama sastras is not a barren abstraction but is an absolute

all-comprehensive Experience in which there is 'Aham or Prakāsa and 'Idam', or the universe of objects. In the Vishvasāra Tantra it is held "what is here is elsewhere" 'Yadantaram taṭ bāhyam'. What is not here is no-where (Yanaehāsti Na Tat Kvachit). In short the whole fabric of limited experience and knowledge point to the Unlimited Infinite all comprehensive Absolute Experience. We 'live through' Time and that is why our limited knowledge is but an aspect of Chit or Absolute Light of pure Consciousness, our finite Ānanda or bliss is here because it is the sensuous aspect of supreme Bliss. An important point which is to be noted here is that in the Supreme absolute Consciousness the Vimarsa-sakti remains latent in its subtlest form, i.e., 'Chitrūpini' is the form of Consciousness itself and is therefore one with it. In other words, in Parama Shiva it is in indistinguishable union with Saṃviṭ. She is then the unmanifested universe in the form of undifferentiated Chit. Raghava vatta in his commentary on the Saradātilak Tantra says (Yā Anādirūpā Chaitanayādhyāsena mahāpralaye sūkshmā sthitā) i.e. she who is eternal existed in a subtle state as one with 'Chit during the final dissolution. (sāradātilak Tantra Chapter I). It is evident that 'Prakāsa' and 'Vimarsa' form an indissoluble unity and in no stage can ever be bifurcated from each other even in the stage of pure Absolute Chit or Consciousness. But it must be remembered that according to the Āgamasastra there are stages or levels of manifestation in the life of the Absolute as the same is essentially the self-manifesting principle of all beings, always one with its Vimarsa-sakti or irresistible free Will-power

of shining forth. When it is said that the universe is of the same essence as the Absolute Consciousness, we do not mean that the universe, as it appears to us or to our limited experience exists in the same form in the unlimited all-comprehensive Absolute Experience. It is obvious if the universe of limited Experience were the same in form with the absolute Experience, the planes would be the same and there would be no difference between all comprehensive Absolute Experience and our limited experience. If the supreme Reality or Parama Shiva thought, experienced and visualised objective world of name and form in the human way, then He would not be the supreme transcendent Reality at all. If He hated and loved, enjoyed and suffered, cognised, conated and acted like mortal beings, He would not be the infinite Absolute Reality but a limited finite human being with all the imperfections and limitations of the mortal plane. Thus according to Āgama sāstras due to differences of planes the same Supreme Reality appears as different without being affected in any way by its appearances. And appearances are real in the sense that they are grosser aspects of the ultimately real, namely Parama Shiva. It would be a mistake, however, to say that they are existent in the real in the form in which the limited beings experience them. They subsist in the Real in very subtle forms as the experience of Parama Shiva. The appearances therefore, are not Absolutely non-existent (Asaṭ). They are essentially Real i.e. they are real in their essence. For that which in its essence and in the most subtlest form constitutes the experience of the Real cannot itself be unreal. Otherwise, we would be involved

in self-contradiction in holding that the experience of the Real itself is unreal. In this connection it will not be out of place to note carefully the points of difference between the Acharyas of Āgama sāstras and those of the Advaita Vedānta. The latter use the category 'Vivarta' and the former use the category 'Ābhasa' respectively in the explanation of the universe. According to 'Āvasavād' the universe is nothing but the process of 'shining forth' (Ābāsana) of the Absolute on account of its intrinsic dynamism. (Vaṛtamānābavāsānām Vābānāmabavāsanaṃ, Aṇtahshitabatānāmeva jhatate bahiratmanā)

Iswara Pratyavijna, 32.

In other woıds, 'Abhasa' is the linguistic expression of the process of the self-revelation of the ultimate Reality which is the pure Light of absolute Consciousness in the phenomenal world. It describes how the 'One' becomes the 'many', how the spirit is wedded to 'matter', how the 'Eternal finds expression in the 'temporal'. The upholders of this doctrine do not bifuıcate time from absolute Reality. Time, according to them, connotes change and continuity. In objective nature, time functions as the power of creation, preservation and destruction, in a word as the irresistible power of self-ingression or Will-to-create inherent in the pure Light of Absolute Consciousness. In spirit time functions as the principle of Expression or 'ullash' without any creative transformation. Hence philosophically the idea of ultimate Reality has been associated more with integral continuity than with change. Continuity (Vimarsha) and integrity (Swatantra) are the main

characteristics of Reality in Saivāgama. In this conception of 'Abhasa' we find a beautiful synthesis of 'Phenomenalism' and 'Nouminalism', of 'Empiricism and spiritualism', of the 'universal' and the 'particular' in the pervasive character of the particular. In short the 'Abhasa process' gives us a Concrete dynamic synthetic synoptic world-view in tune with the spiritual. 'Āvasharūpaeva Jadachetanapadārtha' (Pratyvijna Vimarśini, Chapter III). This doctrine of 'Āvāsa' as the process of manifestation, is called 'Āvāsavada' or Avasa-Paramārth-Vāda and also 'Svātantrya-Vāda' as in 'spanda sandoha'. The 'spanda Kārika' says 'That process of manifestation is to be known as opening out or blossoming forth as of a flower, whereby there arises in the universal Mind absorbed in some one thought, some other thought spontaneously arising by itself. This can be felt in our personal experience of thinking and experiencing out. It is the process whereby the homogeneous gradually unfolds itself into the heterogeneous, the subtle becoming the gross. In the absolute the entire universe with all its variety remains latent in a state of perfect synthesis or 'perfect whole'. Just as in the yolk of the peacock the whole variety of colours, filaments, and parts of a full grown peacock remain in subtle concentrated form, similarly the entire universe with its manifold variety remains in a state of perfect identity with the Absolute. This analogy has often been represented by the aphorism, 'Maūrānda-Rasa-Nāya'. Therefore the universe is a change not 'of' Brahman or Absolute but 'in' Brahman; change is not change of essence but change of form, a manifestation from subtle to gross and the gross is not different from the

subtle in essence, the heterogeneous is not different from the homogeneous and all 'unmesa' or shining forth is a process of becoming, a continuum. This has very aptly been said in 'Púrnamadaḥ pūrnamīdaṃ Pūrnāṭpūrnamudachayte, púrnasya purnamādāya púrnamevāvashishyate'. In other words, the whole is from the whole, and remains always as it is in itself in spite of its manifestation; as every bit of experience is intrinsically related to and identical in essence with all-comprehensive unitary Experience which is the Absolute. Thus ābhāsa may be compared to the process in which one light lightens up one or more lights without being exhausted in any way. Thus the process has been called a process of shining forth from light to light. The doctrine of 'Ābhāsa' means first of all a change from the subtle to the gross, though the gross remains identical in essence with the subtle. In the second place it implies that all change is in the absolute and not of the Absolute; in other words, though there is change the Absolute remains forever the unchangeable, inexhaustible light of Absolute Consciousness. Thus though the light of Absolute Consciousness shines forth out of the fulness of life, light and joy within it, nevertheless it does not cease to be what it is in itself. The point may be further illustrated with reference to the life history of a single biological cell. A careful observation of it will reveal that the cell-life, multiplies itself, as it develops and expands but it cannot be said that a real division has taken place in the principle of 'life' itself. If it were so, then life in the new cells would become divided and thus would be diminished in each new cell. But it is an observed fact that there is as much

life in new cells as there was in the original cell. Thus life remains one unique principle though manifested in the many, there is only manifestation of life but manifestation does not mean diminution or delimitation or any real change. The life principle ever remains both qualitatively and quantitatively the same. It may not be possible by the methods of observation and experiment to perceive the source of life in the empirical and by means of empirical knowledge. The source of life which is the Light of Absolute Consciousness is available for the Yogins who attain trans-empirical Experience. The process may be illustrated further by reference to the Law of Conservation of Energy. According to this law the totality of Energy or power remains constant while there may be transformation of energy from the spiritual to the mental, from the mental to the vital, from the vital to the molecular, from the molecular to the molar or mechanical or material. Thus all transformations are mutations of name and form and not of essence. But according to the Vivartavād of Vedānta these appearances are mere appearances, have no reality of the Real in them. In the true sense of the term, change contradicts Reality as Reality contradicts change. Reality is unchanging, ever existing absolute principle. The appearances are unreal, for they are forever non-existent in the Supreme Reality. Thus being non-existent in the Supremely Real, they are not of the nature of Reality in their essence. They rather belong to the realm of Māyā which is the inexplicable Principle of eternal falsity. It is neither saṭ, because it is non-existent in the saṭ-chiṭ, or Being-consciousness, nor it can be absolutely non-existent

because the 'this' or, 'Idam' constitutes a beginningless series of experiences and facts of Experiences. Thus Māyā has been defined by the upholders of the doctrine of Vivarta as 'Sadasaṭvyāṃ anirvachyā Mithyābhutā Sanātańi'. In other words Māyā is an inexplicable indefinable eternal 'falsity' which is non-existent in the Absolute but existent only in the domain of the chaotic flux of experience. Thus the principle of Māyā is applicable to the realm of appearances or phenomena only. The Absolute is the only Real and appearances are absolutely unreal. The world of matter, life, mind is an Eternal 'falsity'. Māyā is like a magician who by the stroke of his magical wand brings miracles into existence which have no real basis whatsoever. They are absolutely unreal. The world therefore is an illusion or hallucination, as a thirsty traveller in a desert who takes for granted the hot sandy waves for an oasis with silvery currents. But the Acharyas of the Āgama sāstras say that Māyā is self-limiting Power in the Absolute. (Meeyate anayā iti Māyā). Thus Maya-sakti is in the Absolute and the Universe is in the Māyā sakti. Prakāsa or chit and Māyā-sakti or Vimarsa sakti are essential characteristics of the Absolute. They without ceasing to be in the Absolute Experience are in it in undistinguishable inalienable union with Parama Shiva, or samviṭ. She is the unmanifested universe in the Absolute in the form of undifferentiated chiṭ. She is also the differentatiated Chiṭ manifested in the Universe. Thus Māyā is real and the Universe which is the same Māyā in her manifestation is also real. For the universe is the Experience of Parama

Shiva and the Experience of Parama Shiva cannot be unreal. Thus the appearances are essentially real and are not the form and creation of some inexplicable indefinable Eternal 'falsity', but Real or Saṭ in their essence. (Idaṃ biswaṃ ekasyām paramaisaryaṭ bhairābāsamchiti abibhāgena bodhātmakena rūpena āstey). It is evident that in Sankara doctrine Māyā is neither 'Sat' real nor 'Asat' unreal, nor both 'Sadasaṭ' and which though not one with Brahman or forming a part of Brahman and therefore not Brahma, is yet inseparably associated with Brahman in its Īshwara aspect (Māyā Brahmāshritā). Thus though not strictly a second reality, yet it is somehow associated with Brahman. Moreover though not a second reality, yet a mysterious inexplicable something of which neither reality nor unreality can be affirmed. It is apparent that the very fact of positing it at all in this form involves directly or indirectly some kind of dualism in Sankara's doctrine. For it is to be noted that in Sankara's doctrine notwithstanding that Māyā is 'eternal falsity', it is not a mere negation or want of something (abhāba) buṭ a positive entity (bhābarūpaṃ ajnānaṃ) i.e. in the nature of a power which creates miracles (aghatanaghatanapatiashī'. Shaiva-sākta doctrine, however, is free from such dualism. The Āchāryas of Shaivāgama says (Brahmakhela idaṃ sarvaṃ sarvaṃ khallidaṃ Brahma). In other words the Universe is the play of Brahma out of the fulness of Ānanda-sakti or bliss within it. This universe is thus the play of Brahma in his Māyā-sakti and the play is enacted within Him and not in anything outside of Him. It is not actuated or inspired by any external necessity but out of the fulness of intrin-

sic joy within it; just as a child plays not being impelled by any want or necessity but out of the fulness of life within it. Thus the universe has been conceived as the dance of Eternity on the 'foot lights' of Time. This Āgamic view is also in conformity with Sruti ('Ānandateva khalu jātāni imāni'...). The sākta doctrine thus explains Māyā sakti with greater simplicity and clarity. The universe in its essence is really 'that' or consciousness or Chit. But the question is, 'in what way' ? According to the Sankara what we sense with our senses is Maya, which is practically something but in a real sense nothing; which yet appears to be something because it is associated with the Absolute which alone is Real. Its appearance as an independent Reality is thus borrowed and in this sense an illusion. When therefore it is said 'all this is Brahma' what we mean is that what is beyond the empirical is Brahma. The rest as appearance is Māyā. The Shaiva philosophy, however, denounces nothing. They say if 'to renounce is to denounce, it is better to retain'. Everything is real for everything is in Brahma, or the ultimately 'Real', for how can there be anything outside of Brahma. Therefore matter, life, mind are in their essence sakti or power, and Shiva and sakti are one. Man is but a spirit or Chit veiling itself with its own power of Māyā sakti. All is Sakti whether as chitsakti or Māyāsakti. When therefore the Āgama sastras say 'All is Brahma' what is meant here is Brahman as Sakti, i.e. as Māyāsakti and chitsakti is one Absolute light of consciousness. When all the saktis or powers remain dissolved in the Light of Absolute Consciousness we attain the level of Parama shiva who is

Mahākāl or Eternity; as sarvānanda very aptly said (Mahākālípralénasya Mahākāla prakirtitaḥ, Mahākālaḥ pralēnasya Mahākālīprakrititaḥ). In other words when the universe is dissolved in Time-power and Time-power is dissolved in the Light of Absolute Consciousness, the supreme Reality is known as Parā samvit or Parama Shiva and when paramashiva veils Himself in his own vimarsa or Māyāsakti, we have the emergence of Time-Power. Who does not know that the universe is but an expression of Time-power; for eveiy thing happens in Time. It thus appears that Acharya Sankara limits Reality to the Prakāsa aspect alone. The Agama Sastra asserts that Reality is constitutive of both Prakāsa and Vimarsa. This divergence of views is based upon the definition of Māyā as stated by Sankara and of Māyāsakti as given by the Agama Sastras The Sháivagama pointedly affirms that just as light and heat co-exist in fire, similarly universal 'Ahantā' and freedom oı Sakti Co-exist in Chaitanya. This freedom is Māyā, which remains identical with chaitanya (Cideka-rūpa) and yet shines out in infinite variety, though 'age cannot wither her nor custom stale her infinite variety' in bringing out the manifold universe, it does not in the least change in its essence. The Shaiva philospphy has tried to explain in detail how the one Paramashiva, Parā samviṭ becomes the 'many'. The Absolute is the transcendent Reality-Bliss-and Light of pure Intelligence as well as the one all-comprehensive supreme Experience in a state of 'Swarūpavishrānti'. There is no need of a universal manifestation or shining forth. In this stage samvit or Paramashiva remains in perfect unison with His Ananda-sakti

and hence it is called 'Shāntaṃ Advaitaṃ', for the essence of Ānanda as perfect Bliss lies in Absolute quiescence in what is one's own innermost self, there being complete cessation of flutter or restlessness and movement. For no perfect Bliss can there be unless there is cessation of all goings and moving out. Psychologically in this stage there is a feeling of absolute rest and perfect peace in one's Universal Experience remaining identical with Paramashiva. It has already been pointed out that according to Shaivāgama just as the question 'why Light illumines ?' is superfluous, similarly the question, 'why there is universal manifestation ?' is redundant; for the nature of Light is to illumine, the nature of the Light of Absolute Consciousness is universal manifestation. But in order that there may be a Universe He polarises Himself by His own Māyāsakti which is the 'Principle of Negation'. 'Nishedhavyāpārarūpā saktiḥ'. According to Saivagama there are mainly three orders of universal manifestation viz. (1) The Ideal or Pure order of manifestation (2) The Pure-Impure order of manifestation, and (3) The Actual or empirical order of manifestation. The former comprises (a) The Shiva Tattwa (b) The Shakti Tattva (c) The Sadāshiva Tattva (d) The Aishvara Tattva (e) The Saḍ-Vidyā Tattva. The first flutter or shining forth of universal manifestation is the subtlest and is called the Shiva Tattva.

In the Absolute transcendental Experience or in the innermost self this feeling can only be the realisation of the Ānandasakti inhering in Chit which is the heart of Reality, (Hridayam

parameshitu'). The 'Hridaya' means heart or essence which means love, joy and Bliss. (Anuttara prathama kalā akul swarūpa pūrnāhanta..Ānanda-saktitasyāmeva bisrānti). In other words, so long the transcendent Paramashiva remains in tune with His universal Experience or Anandasakti there is yet no need of shining forth, being all-complete in Himself. The Brihadarānyaka upanishad says 'Just as a man, when embraced by his beloved wife knows nothing that is without, nothing that is within; thus does the Purasha, when embraced by the Pragnātmān knows nothing that is without, nothing that is within. In other words universal manifestation remains one with the transcendent Paramashiva as an Absolute Idea, or Absolute Experience, and just as there is no difference between the Experiencer and Expeiience, similarly all comprehensive Universal, Paramashiva there is no externality. But he is not devoid of Vimarsasakti or Māyāsakti which remains one with Him in the form of an Ideal Universe. The universe at this stage is an Idea of the Absolute, or an 'Absolute Idea'. But in order that there may be an Ideal universe or ideal manifestation there arises a 'stress' spanda in the all-quiescent stage of perfect Light of Supreme Absolute Consciousness on account of the predominance of His own jnānasakti or the power of Intelligence and lets the Ideal Universe emerge in His own view. As a result the quiescent stage of the Absolute is broken. There is a stir or stress in the Absolute quiescence and there is a dim feeling of distinction in Paramashiva as His Ānandasakti emerges out of Him. This feeling or separation generates the feeling of want of a Universe. Without this

feeling the manifested universe could never have come into existence. In this stage Paramashiva remains in all his pristine identity with only the elimination of the Ideal Experience of the Ideal Universe. The Experience of the stage is the experience of the transcendent as well as the immanent aspect of samviṭ. This is called the Shivatattva which emerges out of Paramashiva without affecting in any way His own transcendent aspect. With the experience of the supremely ideal Universe negatived, the Shiva Tattva is the pure Light of Consciousness without anything whatsoever to shine upon, just as we can think of the sun when there is nothing to shine upon. This is the first Person singular number 'I' which cannot be generalised, devoid of any feeling or thought like 'I am'; for the verb 'to be' implies change in time, a relation such as 'I am this', 'I am here'. All such expressions imply bifurcation (Bheda-Buddhi) i.e. 'I am what is here and now' I am something which is a limited thing but as there is in this state no feeling of Idantā or 'this' or any limitation or of an 'Idam' meaning the ideal manifestation, this stage is called shiva-tattva. This is the pure 'I' or the shiva principle (Parichhinna-Nirvikalpa-Chit). Hence Shiva-tattva may be called the pure 'I' or the self in its singular form as a single unitary principle free from any Vikalpa or determination, ideal or actual. It is the first stage in the process of the Universal manifestation (Jatayamanuttoramūrtinijechhayā Nikhilamidam Jagaṭ Prasphutaṃ Spandetu Sa spandaḥ prathamaḥ sivatattvamuchayte—Tattva Sandoha I). The words 'Prathama spanda' here implies the first flutter of becoming which is the

ground and goal of all terrestrial evolution. The empirical or the phenomenal is the imperfect and limited unfolding in time of an eternally perfect and self-existent Shiva. It is, in other words, the alogical element, the 'I' which is presupposed in the synthetic unity of absolute Consciousness in the language of Kant. This principle of 'I-ness' or 'Ahantā' when considered per se may be regarded as the matter of which thought or consciousness is the form. According to shaivgama the unifying thought form, the 'Logos' cannot be abstracted from its alogical matter, 'the hyle'. The ultimate all-comprehensive material Nitya sarvagata sthanu achaloyam sanātana-sreemat Bhagbat Geeta)— which is shiva, the inner-most self is the aspect of pure 'Being' penetrating the process of becoming. It is the self-existent Consciousness which is the presupposition of self-consciousness. Thus the potential and material moment of the Absolute transcendental Consciousness is Shiva, the actual and formal moment of the Absolute is Sakti or universal power.

(2) The Saktitattva.

The next stage in the process of becoming is called the Shaktitattva. It is to be noted here that there is no time-interval between the emergence of Shivatattva and that of shaktitattva. They are according to Shaivagama inseparably associated. They are 'being' and 'becoming' aspects of the same transcendental Absolute Light of Consciousness. It has already been pointed out that Shivatattva is being-consciousness', (saṭ). It is Paramashiva in

all essentials and in every respect with the experience of the Ideal universe eliminated, or negatived or dissolved. But the question is, 'by whom the act of negation becomes possible ?' This is done by the Saktitattva. Hence it may be said that it is by the action of the saktitattva that the emergence of Shivatattva is made possible. But Shivatattva and Shaktitattva being inseparable are continuous with each other, and are eternally existent, for they never disappear at the time of universal dissolution; but remain in the Absolute Light of pure Consciousness Parā-samvit as the form and potency of all becoming or universal manifestation. It is a common doctrine of Shaiva philosophy that the one Absolute Light of pure Consciousness has two aspects; the one is the static Shiva aspect and the other Kinetic shakti aspect. But these two aspects are inseperably associated and imply the reconciliation of changelessness as well as change. In other words, the Absolute Light of pure Consciousness by the operation of its own intrinsic dynamism polarises itself into 'I-this' 'Aham-Idam'. 'Shiva-sakti', the positive-Negative. Of the shiva-sakti tattva, shiva represents 'Prakāsha and sakti 'vimarsha' aspects respectively. The shivatattva is 'Prakashamátra', that is the pure 'I' without a 'this' or with the ideal universe eliminated. This is a state in which the Absolute Light of unitary Consciousness is broken up to the extent that is no longer the Perfect Experience in which the 'I' (Aham) and 'this' (Idam) exist in undistinguishable union. It is the one supreme 'I-consciousness' 'Aham-pratiti' only which is the root of all limited subjectivity. This is borne out when we analyse experience. The 'I'-side of experience is that in

which the self rests in the light of one's own self without looking towards another (Ananyomukhaḥ Aham-Pratyayaḥ) while the Idam or 'this' (Vimarsa) of experience looks towards another. (yastu ananuamukhaḥ Sā Idam Iti pratyayaḥ). These are but aspects of the supreme Experience called Parā samviṭ which is the coalescence into one undifferentiated 'I' Shiva and the 'this' that is sakti. The former is the illuminating Prakāsha, knowing aspect and the latter is Vimarsha or 'the known' aspect. Shiva and sakti are not two, but exist in mutual embrace and love. This is 'supreme love' (Niratishayapremāspadatvam Anandatattvaṃ). When there is neither without nor within, neither the ideal nor the actual, When all thought of lover, love and beloved are forgotten in blissful ecstasy which is the supreme Experience. Thus Paramashiva is the experience of the ideal Universe. This is the Parā Vāk the supreme 'Logos' of the ancient grammarians (Amarsha Paranādagarbhaha). From this it follows that the Shivatattva is the first stress of creative movement of the unmoving Paramashiva. Saktitattva is the negative aspect of the same Shivatattwa, because it negates the ideal Universe which is the experience of Paramashiva. Hence Shiva is called the very void, (Shūnnātisūnna) in other words the object-content of experience, so to speak, is a mere negation. It is shūnya because it is empty of objective content, it is featureless, contentless, absolute Experience. Thus Shivatattva is the first vibratory movement or stress towards a universal manifestation and Saktitattva is what regulates, guides and controls Shiva's onward march as the principle of negation or restraint.

It may be mentioned here that though Shiva-saktitattva is the self-expression or in modern language the self-ingression of Paramashiva or the supreme light of Absolute Consciousness, yet they are eternally existent in the Paramashiva. For they are not totally annihilated at the time of universal dissolution or pralaya but remain in the heart or essence of Paramashiva as 'pure being' of the evolution of the universe. Shivatattva is the saṭ or being aspect, Saktitattva is the becoming aspect or the potentiality of the infinite variety of forms in which 'Being' is manifested in a full-fledged way. The Saktitattva may be called in modern philosophical term the 'Elan vital' or 'The Nisus' immanent teleological factor in the first stress (spanda) of 'Being' or 'saṭ'.

(3) THE SADĀSHIVATATTVA.

The self-luminous, self-conscious trans-empirical Experience gradually unfolds itself into the Sadāshivatattva. This stage in the self-unfolding, self-unrolling process in the life of the Absolute marks the beginning of its self-projection into the not-self in the form of the experience, 'I-am-this'. The 'This' (Idam) is indistinctly and indefinitely perceived by the 'I' (Aham) as part of the one self, the emphasis being laid on the 'I-side' of experience. This stage is thus characterised by the predominance of the spirit over matter. This experience in the form 'I-am-this' has reference in thought and feeling to the Ideal Universe which remains merged in Shiva-shakti stage of the supreme light of transcendental Consciousness. At this stage the Ideal Universe

is experienced, as it were, as the first stress of experiencing out or shining forth into something vague and indistinct in the subliminal depth of absolute Consciousness. This stage may be compared to the psychological state of one who is just awakening from a state of perfectly dreamless sound sleep. He has an indeterminate undefined feeling of a something. In his innermost being he begins to bring back to memory his true character and state and may just indistinctly begin to think as 'I-am-this-and-this', the 'this' being as yet of an indeterminate undefined character but referring nevertheless to what is external to his innermost nature, that is, to what constitutes the 'this' (Idam) in the experience of the 'I'. It has already been pointed out that the Sadāshivatattva indicates the first flutter or stress (spanda) of the pure Light of Consciousness and as it indicates the first flutter of supreme Consciousness, the experience of the Ideal Universe or the Universe as an Idea is very vaguely realised like the faint indistinct memory of a long forgotten music which is beginning to rise from beneath the innermost depth of consciousness to the surface but is still in a subtle form lying deep into it. It is evident that in such an experience, 'I-am-this' the realisation of the 'I' (Ahaṃpratyavamarsha) is a more dominant factor than the 'This' (Idam) which refers to the Ideal Universe. It has already been pointed out that it is also a state in which there is just the awakening of 'being' (saṭ) in the experience of 'I-am-this' and has therefore been called the Sadāshivatattva, in other words that state in which there is for the first time the experience of 'Being'. 'Sadākhyāyaṃ bhabaṇ yataḥ saditi

prakhya—(Pratyvijna Vimarshini—111, i. 2)'. It is also the state in which the volitional aspect or Ichcha aspect (i.e. the power of feeling oneself as supremely able and of an absolutely irresistible Will and of forming a divine resolve as to what to do or create), of the Divine shakti is the dominant feature. The Jnānashakti (or the power of knowing, of consciousness pure and simple without any reference to emotional feeling or will) and the Kriyāshakti (or the power of creating) of the supreme Consciousness of Paramashiva are held in suspense. This Icccha aspect of Paramashiva Constitutes the feeling which may be described as one of 'Divine wonder' as to what to do, of Divine resolve as to what is to be done and as such is prior to any actual movement or activity and as there is pure will-to-do following a state of perfect rest or bliss, it is naturally a state in which the Ichcha aspect is just awakened or released, it is the state of self-ingression or immanent divine urge to initiate movement, a necessary prior step to any action. This is so because unless the self or the 'I' is conscious of itself as a Being endowed with an irresistible Will there can be no action. It follows from this that the Sadāshivatattva constitutes the initial step of the process of universal manifestation. This stage has been called in the Āgama shāstrā unmesha or opening of the eyes of Paramashiva or the volitional stress in trans-empirical Consciousness as contrasted with the Nimesha or closing of the eyes or retreat of the same Supreme Light of Absolute Consciousness into its pristine glory. In the former the Universe as inherent shakti, power or irresistible Will is perecived vaguely.

This may be compared to the Pashyantivāk of the ancient grammarians where the self perceives itself as 'this' in a very undefined vague way or in other words as an 'Idea'. In the Vaishnavatantra the Sadāshivatattva has been called the Mahavishnu and in the Buddhistic tantra it has been called 'Avalokiteshvara' or one who shines forth in his compassion.

While closing this Chapter, it is to be noted here that in the Āgama shāstra, Paramashiva or Parāsamviṭ is not regarded as a Tattva for it is 'Tattvatita' or beyond all tattvas. Shivatattva and Saktitattva have been considered as distinct tattvas, but Saktitattva is but the negative aspect or self-veiling aspect of Shivatattva. The Sivasakti tattva remain in inseparable union with Parāsamvit, they are there even in dissolution. In Tantrik philosophy the Parāsamvit or Parabhrahman or the Absolute Consciousness is never bereft of the power of universal manifestation or the power of shining forth, 'Prakasa' and 'vimarsha' form the two poles of one and the same Absolute. The first emanated tattva is the Sadāshivatattva or Sadākhytattva of which pure Being-Consciousness becomes conscious of being, for herein lies the first incipiency of the world-experience as the notion, 'I-am-this' which ultimately breaks into 'I' and 'this'. Further in Parā Samviṭ the 'I' and the 'this', 'Shiva' or 'Prakāsha' and Sakti or 'Vimarsha' form an indissoluble unity. Through the preponderance and operation of Saktitattva, the principle of negation (Nishedhavyapārarūpa Saktiḥ), there arises the first stress (Prathama spanda) in the Absolute

supreme Consciousness and the 'Idam' or 'This' is withdrawn from the all comprehensive unitary Experience so that the 'I-experience' (Ahamvimarsha) alone remains as a pure subjectivity wherefrom ideal manifestation or the universe as an Idea or experience of Shiva is withdrawn. But in Sadāshivatattva, the 'This' or 'Idam' aspect appears as a vague undefined outline in the form of 'I-am-this', though the emphasis is still on the 'I-side' of 'I-am-this'.

(4) The Aishvartattva or Iśhvaratattva

In the unfolding, unrolling process of universal manifestation the next tattva in which the pure light of Absolute Consciousness manifests itself is Iśhvaratattva. The Sadāshivatattva which is the principle of Being—consciousness (Saṭchit) in which irresistible will-power is the dominant feature, manifests itself in Iśhvaratattva. In other words, all-comprehensive Absolute Experience which realises itself as the Divine Experiencer as a Being with an irresistible will to act shines forth in the form 'This-is-I' (Idam-Aham). The 'I-this' (Ahamidam) involved in the all-comprehensive synthetic Experience evolves into 'This-I' tattva or Iśhvaratattva. In the Sadāshivatattva the emphasis is on the 'Aham' or the 'I', in the Iśhvaratattva the emphasis is on the 'Idam' or 'this' aspect of Absolute Experience. The Ideal Universe or the Universe as an Idea which is indistinctly and indefinitely present in Sadāshivatattva becomes more or less prominent in the experience of 'this'. In other words, the universe as an Idea is externally projected as a 'this'. The vague

indistinct 'this' gradually unfolds itself into the 'what' of experience. The self congnizes itself as being manifested in the 'Idam', it becomes conscious of what he really is, he begins to be aware of his states as the 'I'-aspect of Absolute Experience gradually falls in the background, the 'this'-aspect comes to the foreground. This experience in this state is confined within the range of 'this-am-I' experience. The 'I'-ness or 'I' as pure being is eclipsed and identified with 'this'-ness of the supreme Consciousness. Yet at this stage the universe remains still as an Ideal Universe and it is called Iśhvaratattva. This is the tattva in which Paramashiva or the supreme light of Consciousness realises what constitutes the Lordliness and the glory of the Divine Being. Further as it is the state in which a comprehensive survey of 'this' (Idam) is realised as the Ideal Universe is taken, the Ideal Universe emerges into the focus of self-consciousness as a clear and distinct picture. In this stage the objective universe is experienced by the 'I' or the self distinctly and yet as an integral part of itself and not separate from it as the reflection in a mirror is cognised as having its being within the mirror or as being a part and parcel of it. This is the Iśvaratattva or the stage of the supreme light of consciousness in which the universe is projected as an 'Idea' well-defined and distict 'Idea' though not yet externalised.

(5) THE SUDDHA-VIDYĀ TATTVA OR THE SAD-VIDYĀ TATTVA

The next Tattva which follows is known as Sad-vidyā or Suddha-vidyā. In Shivatattva, the

light of Absolute Consciousness manifests itself or shines forth as the 'I'-experience (Aham-Vimarsha), in the Sadāshivatattva the same supreme consciousness manifests itself as the 'I'-this experience (Aham-Idam-Vimarsha), in Iśhvaratattva it is the 'this-I' experience (Idam-Aham-Vimarsha). In the first stage, the 'I' is realised as the innermost self, an unchanging Reality, of the nature of a purely experiencing principle as distinguished from either the experienced or the means of experience. So in this stage there is exclusive emphasis on the self. In the second stage the emphasis is, no doubt, upon the 'I' or Aham, yet there being a predominance of will-power, the this' or Idam is manifested as an integral part of the 'I' or as intermingled with the 'I'. In the third stage, the emphasis is on the 'this', 'Idam' though the 'this' is manifested in the womb of the 'I'. The 'Idam' or 'this' is the more prominent aspect of the all-comprehensive Experience and 'I-side' recedes in the background. In the Sad-Vidyātattva there is an equilibrium of the 'I' and the 'this' (Sāmādhikaranya). There is equal emphasis on both the aspects. Absolute Experience which takes the form of 'I' and 'this' in which both the 'I' and the 'this' are realised distinctly. Though they are felt as entirely identified with each other, yet they can be clearly distinguished in thought as forming the two poles of the one inseparable 'whole', in other words as forming the subject and the object of experience. But the experiencing subject realises the 'this' (Idam) as belonging to him or as 'mine'. The point may be illustrated by reference to our daily experience. In our daily life we identify ourselves with our thoughts, feelings and volitions

and yet distinguish these as belonging to the self. I think all these states and processes are mine. Thus there is an equalisation of both the terms in experience which is that of the true relation of the 'Aham' or 'I' and the 'Idam' or 'This' forming a synthesis on a single basis (Adhikarana) and not on two different bases. There is, of course, a difference between duality and dualism out of realisation of the equilibrium of the two factors 'I' and the 'this' of the Absolute Experience. In this state and at the same time the realisation of the one as being possessed by the other, there arises for the first time what may be called the experience of diversity in unity (Bhedābhedatattva) or as it is called 'Parāparadasha' or 'vedāvedavimarshanātnaka-sadviḍyā- (Svachchhanda tantıa—IV 95). It is spoken of as the experience of unity in diversity in the form of mantra. It is the experience of the distinction between the 'Idam' manifesting, itself as distınct from 'Aham'. It is also the experience of non-distinction, because the 'Idam' is experienced as belonging to the 'Aham'. This experience is compared to the experience of Ishvara of the Dvaitavadins who visualises the universe as distinct from Himself but as forming an integral paıt of Himself. All this is my manifestation (Sarvomamāyam Vivaḥ). The experience is said to be in the nature of mantra, because here we are ın the plane of pure spiritual ideation. The 'this' of the experience is now realised as not a pure undivided 'this' or as a unit, but as a whole, that is, as an all-this (Sarvamkhallidam) as the unity-in-diversity or all-this, at this stage it is of the nature of pure ideas, thoughts and feelings. They are natuıally realised as shining forth or emerging out

of the pure experiencing principle or the Experiencer himself in much the same way as a limited human being in his daily life realises his own thoughts and feelings as emerging out of himself, 'I am all-this' and 'all-this' is mine as forming integral part of myself and 'all-this' emerges out of me as my glory or 'Aisharya'—that what constitutes the Experience. Thus in this stage the Experiencer or the Mantra-pramāta realises distinctly some contrast between the 'I' which is felt as an absolutely 'undivided Unity' and the 'This' which as the proto-type of multiplicity of the universe of sensible objects and psychical experience perceived as other than the 'I' and as bearing the potentiality of diversity. But it is to be noted here that the 'I' or the self feels that all this is yet something possessed by him as being really nothing else than his own experience. In the Sadāshivatattvā the emphasis is laid chiefly on the 'I'-side of the all-comprehensive Supreme Experience, while in the Iśhvaratattva the emphasis is laid principally on the 'This'—side, that is, on what constitutes the Aishvaryya, that is the lordly state of the Experiencer. Therefore, in these two states there can be no contrast between the two sides of the experience 'I am this' and therefore there is little chance of realising both the contrast and the unity which subsists between the two. It is evident that in the Shuddhavidyātattva, there is the manifestation of the Kriyāshakti of the Supreme Consciousness or Paramashiva, potentiality becoming kinetic (Sarvākarayogittam Kriyāsaktiḥ). There is thus some movement, some inward urge in 'thought' for polarisation. By the equality of the 'I' and the

'this' the Absolute Experience is in the state of readiness for the next stage in which the two aspects are to be bifurcated. Upto this stage all the five tattvas form the unit of Ideal manifestation when the universe is realised as an Idea'. Because in all the above stages the universe is purely an Ideal one, they constitute the pure order of being, that is, the universe is realised in its true essential nature and therefore they constitute what is called Suddhavidyā, that is the domain of pure spiritual order.

It is to be specially mentioned in this connection that all the above Tattvas namely Shivatattva, Shaktitattva, Sadāshivatattva, Ishvaratattva and Suddhavidyatattva remain as identical with Paramashiva or the supreme light of Absolute Consciousness, as there is no bifurcation yet at all, there is no differentiation in it. All these form the potential stages of universal manifestation which is a stage of pure homogeniety, in other words, the universe has not yet appeared as distinct from pure light of Absolute Consciousness. This is the germinal state, as it were, of universal manifestation. The subjective and objective aspects of all-comprehensive Experience not being separated from each other remain involved in it. In the language of Spinoza, it comprises the vision of world as an unity in its pure foim, sub specie eternitatis. These tattvas can be likened to Platonic 'Forms' which are universal in character, as there is as yet no experience of anything in particular and Paramashiva as the Form of forms.

In both Shaiva and Shākta philosophy and in the philosophy of ancient grammarians, the Abso-

lute Consciousness or Parāsamvit, the Supreme Experience or Paramashiva has primarily a twofold aspect : (a) a transcendental aspect in which He is beyond all universal manifestations, (b) an immanent aspect in which he is the in-dwelling informing spirit of all. There are thus two principal aspects in the Absolute, namely, Prakāsha or Chit aspect or the 'I'-aspect and Vimarsha aspect or the becoming-aspect, the potential objectivity or 'Idam' which unrolls itself into the Universe. According to ancient grammarians this Absolute 'Logos' is the equilibrated unity of both 'Vidyā' or pure being and 'Avidyā' or becoming (Sarvābhih Saktivih Samāvistanca Vidyāvidyā pravibhāgarupancha). But it is to be noted here that in the Supreme Experience the Vimarsha shakti or the potential objectivity is in its supreme subtlest form, this stage is in the form of Consciousness itself, its grosser form is in the form of the universe. This Vimarsha shakti is there in the form of Consciousness (chidrūpinī), it is one with chit, in other words the Aham and the Idam, the 'I' and the 'This' without ceasing to be in the Supreme light of Absolute Consciousness are in undistinguishable, undifferentiated union as chit. As she is then in undistinguishable union with consciousness, she is also simply unmanifested chit, that is, she is the same as chit and yet, though she is one with Him, she is latent objectivity. Rāghava-Bhatta, in his commentary on Sāradātilaka tantra (Chapter I) says "she who is eternal existed in the subtlest unmanifested form as Consciousness, during the final dissolution (Yā anādirūpā chaitanyādhyāsenā mahāpralaye sūkshmāsthitā). In other words, she is then of the nature of pure Self or Consciousness,

just as Light with its power of illumination remains one identical whole when there is no external object to illumine. This state has been technically described as the state of ātmabishrānti or Ātmaraman or the play of the self with itself in which the self enjoys itself not in the form of external object but as its own shakti. In shākta philosophy shakti or power is always one with the self and the object of the self; for the object is always the self, since there is nothing but the self. Though Parāsamviṭ or supreme light of transcendental Consciousness represents the changeless aspect, yet this changeless aspect is not opposed to change, just as static aspect of power is not opposed to its dynamic aspect, Potentiality is not opposed to actuality. In other words, Consciousness has two aspects : static and dynamic, sat-chit or pure Being—consciousness (Mahāsattavā) in which stage it is self-luminous, that is, it illumines itself when there is nothing external to it to illumine. It is also self-conscious which is its Vimarsha-aspect involving object-consciousness. Self-luminosity and self-consciousness, Prakāsha and Vimarsha, form the two poles of one and the same thing, neither exists without the other. Thus in Saivāgama and in Shākta philosophy the Shiva or the pure transcendental self when considered as it is in itself may be regarded as supreme absolute Consciousness. There is an attempt here to synthesise and reconcile the 'logos' with its alogical matter, i.e. with its 'hyle'. Thus Shiva is the pure self and Shakti or power is self's consciousness of itself. In the previous chapter it has already been pointed out that the Shivatattva is the pure 'I' with the 'This' undistinguished, hence it is called Prakāsha-

mātra. This is a stage in which the unitary supreme Absolute Consciousness is broken upto this extent, that it is no longer the Perfect Experience (Purnāhantā) in which the Aham and the 'Idam', the 'I' and the 'this' exist as forming an undifferentiated whole, but there is one Supreme Aham or the 'I', first person singular number which cannot be determined or generalised in any way. This state has been very beautifully defined by Sarvānanda in the following aphorism (Mahākali-praleenasya mahākala prakirtitaḥ), in other words, the Parāshaṃvit or the Absolute consciousness is the pure self or Shivatattva when the Vimarsha-shakti or the power of universal manifestation lies dissolved in it as its essence in the form of chit-shakti. This is a stage in which, as it has already been pointed out, there is emphasis on the 'Aham' or the 'I' and in which there is the negation of the ideal universe or 'Idam' in its ideal form. But the question is, 'how this ideal universe is negated and by whom'. The universe-negating power cannot be a separate power but it remains as latent power in shivatattva in inseparable union, but as it is conceived as power, it is always conceived as contraction and expansion. As its first stress or moment of expansion the sadāshivatattva emerges into Aham or in other words, the Absolute Experience manifests itself in the form of 'I-this' experience. As its second stress or moment, and all other subsequent stages the Sadākhyātattva and Ishvaratattva emerge. It should be noted here that all these tattvas form a continuum without any break in the continuity just as points in a straight line. The 'Idam' here is potential objectivity and forms an integral part of the self and not as separate

from it. Further, there is no outei and inner. The 'this' or 'Idam' at this stage is presented to the 'Aham' or the 'I' like an undistinguishable picture in an undifferentiated subjectivity. This has been called 'Nimesha' or closing of shakti or power or involution of power; it is so called because it is the last stage in involution before all effects are dissolved into their first causal stress or piimordial Power. Being the last stage in involution it constitutes the first state of universal manifestation. Then the Idam-side or this-side of Absolute Experience gradually unfolds itself in which there is more emphais. 'This' stage has been called the unmesha, the shining forth of shakti. At this stage Absolute is on the threshold of breaking itself into two halves. How it is effected has beeṅ veiy aptly explained in both Shaiva and Shākta philosophy.

CHAPTER VI

(6) THE MĀYĀ TATTVA WITH ITS FIVE-FOLD POWERS.

It has already been indicated that the pure Light of Absolute Consciousness has two aspects, namely:—(a) the aspect of self-abnegation or self-ingression by virtue of which there is the appearance of the universe of matter, life and mind; the other aspect is the aspect of pure self-involution in which there is a return or dissolution of the universe into its ultimate reality. The supreme 'I' is called the purnāhantā or the all-comprehensive, all-perfect 'I' transcending all dualism and duality. Therefore, it is nothing in particular, it is purely a universal principle in which the principle of individuation or particularisation or differentiation remains latent in an undifferentiated undistinguishable form. Thus such a universal is not barren abstraction like Spinoza's Absolute, but a concrete universal comprehending within itself the principle of Shakti or power or potentiality of all particularisation. Thus the entire universe of particulars exist in identity with it just as heat exists inseparably with fire. In the same way the universal Ahantā and its free power of self-ingression or self-abnegation exist in perfect identity. This free power or Svatantra shakti is Māyā shakti. Māyā is also called a tattva, because it is the principle of limitation or particularisation. Though in essence it is identical with chaitanya (Ci-deka-rupa), it brings out the infinite variety of limited objects. In the previous chapter we have seen that with the emergence of pure tattva, shuddhavidyā, the mani-

festation of the universe is purely an Ideal one, because in this purelv ideal state of manifestation, that is, in the pure order, the 'tattvas' are realised as belonging to the 'I' and the universe is also apprehended in essence, that is, they constitute the pure order of beings. In other words, those tattvas are the pure states of the Absolute Experiencing principle. From the metaphysical point of view as well as from the psychological point of view, they are universal beings who realise themselves actually as such and have for their Experience the whole of the universe 'all-this' in different stages. But with the disappearance of the Shuddhavidyā, there begins the appearance of Avidyā or Ashuddha-vidyā which constitutes the experience of limited beings, or empirical selves, who as such realise not the whole of 'all-this' but only the limited aspects of it and who also consider themselves as individuals and as mutually exclusive finite beings. It is to be noted here that it is the selfsame Absolute light of Consciousness or Paramashiva who in the first place owing to the fulness of joy within (Ānanda-shakti) manifests Himself first in the pure order of beings like Shiva-tattva, Shakti-tattva, Sadāshiva-tattva, Ishvara-tattvā and Sadvidya-tattvā and in the second place in limited entities which constitute the universe of limited objects and individuals. The former order of manifestation may be regarded as the ideal or spiritual order, while the latter may be considered as the manifestation of the limited finite order. And as it comprises the limited states of Absolute Experience, the manifestation from this standpoint is called Ashuddha-vidyā, that is, the manifestation of the

imperfect order or the Māyā's way, because the principle which emerges first out of this impure and imperfect order and from which all other downward movements follow is what is called Māyā. The function of this power is to obscure, to delimit the all-comprehensive Experience. It veils the true nature of both what is experienced or the object of experience and the Experiencing Principle or the self. The moot philosophical problem, 'how the One becomes the Many,' or 'how the universal is manifested in the particulars of the universe', has been variously answered by different philosophers. We will consider here the views of Achārja Shankara in his Advaitavāda, Maharshi Kapil in his Shankhya Philosophy and by the shaiva and shākta Āgamas. According to Advaita vedānta there are four states of Consciousness or Experience the (a) Jāgrat or the waking stage, (b) Swapna or the dreaming stage, (c) Sushuspti or the stage of perfectly dreamless sound sleep and (d) Turiya or the transcendental plane. From the saṇkarite standpoint of Advaita-Siddhi, the turiya state or the transcendental Experience (Nirvishesajnānam) is the only reality or fact. From the standpoint of Shaiva and Shākta Āgama, not only the Turia Experience or the transcendental Experience alone is real, but the whole of Experience, namely, the whole fact of being and becoming constitute the ultimate Reality. In so far as the Universe is Shiva's Experience, it can never be unreal. The point which needs clarification here is, 'what do we understand by the 'Real' ?' According to Shankara, the 'Real' must be absolutely changeless principle in all the three times, past, present and the future. It therefore contradicts

change and all its modes. Change or the world of becoming is unreal. Jagaṭprapancha or the universe is thus unreal. Shankara also holds the view that there are three levels or planes of being or (Sattvā) namely the transcendental or the (Pāraṃārthīka) empirical or (the Vyāvahāıika), and illusory or (the Prātibhāsika). Thirdly according to Shankara a higher plane Contradicts the lower, as for example, the third plane is contradicted by the second and the first or the transcendental plane has nothing to contradict it. Thus there is a process of gradual evolution from becoming or change to changeless Absolute Consciousness which is a pure Identity. The 'Vedāntā Paribhāshā' holds that parinamā or change or transformation exists when the effect and its efficient cause or the material cause belongs to the same level of existence as in the case of clay and pot, milk and curd, both of which belong to the Vyāvahārika or the empirical plane; clay being the material cause, and the pot the effect or its change or transformation (Paıināmo hi Upadānasamasattaka-Kāryyāpattih). When however the effect's level of existence is otheı than (Vishama) that of its upadan or efficient cause, as for example, the rope belongs to Vyāvahārika level of existence or empirical plane and the snake belongs to the Prātibhāsika level of existence or the appaıently actual level of existence, there is vivarta (Vivarttoh iupādāna-vishama-sattaka-Kāryyapattih). Thus it is evident, in the case of rope-snake, the Sattā or being of the rope is Vyāvahārika or empirical; while the Sattā of ropesnake is only Prātibhāsika orapparently actual. The same reasoning leads

us to the conclusion that the rope and the whole 'Jagatprapancha' (universe) is a vivarta from the standpoint of the Supreme Light of Absolute Consciousness. Thus from the highest plane the universe is contradicted and is only a vivarta.

On the contrary, both the Shaiva and Shākta Āgama, hold that the Absolute Experience or Parāsamviṭ comprehends two aspects namely the quiescent state (Asabda) and the stress sphotā or spanda—pure being and becoming. To emphasize the one aspect at the expense of the other is to consider the Absolute into two bifurcated Cross-sections which will lead us to self-contradiction. Changelessness and Change, Being and Becoming are not contradictory. A thing is not unreal, because it changes, prakāsa or self-luminosity and self-consciousness or vimarsha are not contradictory. Achārja Sankara limits reality to the prakāsha or the self-luminous aspect of the Absolute only, while in both the Shaiva and Shākta philosophy, the absolute Light of Consciousness comprehends within itself both self-luminosity and self-consciousness. It may be mentioned here that this divergence of views leads us to the different views of Māyā as propounded by Sankara and by the Shaiva and Shākta philosophy.

According to Achārja Sankara, Māyā is neither real (Saṭ), nor unreal (asaṭ), nor partly real and partly unreal but an inexplicable unthinkable alogical principle (Anirvachaniya). It is not Brahman or the Absolute, for it is Nesceince or eternal Falsity, while Brahman is eternal Truth. Though in Sankara's doctrine Māyā is not a second reality,

yet it being absolutely non-existent in the ultimate Reality or Brahman is somehow posited as a second principle to explain the universe of objects; and thus there is a tinge of dualism in his non-dualistic system. The attempt to explain the world of becoming by an inexplicable eternal falsity seems to be unconvincing. Further according to him, Jiva is Brahman or the Absolute itself (Jivaḥ Brahmaiva Nāparaḥ) from the transcendental standpoint, but empirically the jiva appears to be the reflection (chidābhāsa) of Brahman on unconscious Avidyā. When this unconscious Avidyā is eliminated man realises his identity with Brahman. In short, Sankara seems to hold the view that there is an apparent unconsciousness which appears to be consciousness through chidābhasā. Thus all appearances or the world of becoming are mere 'names and forms' (namarupamātra) and under no circumstances can be real in the true sense of the word. They are not essentially real, because they are for all times, past, present and future non-existent in the supreme reality. Now according to the Shaiva and Shākta philosophy, Māyā is the power of Paramashiva, i.e. his power of self-obscuration. Its chief function is to veil and to delimit the Absolute Experience. It delimits both the Experiencer himself as well as the experienced. The universal, 'all-this' which is realised in the Shuddhavidyātattva passes out of His view, that is, is obscured and in its place there arises the awareness of a vague indistinct, undefined something, that is, limited particularity. It is thus the pure light of Absolute Consciousness obscuring or veiling itself and not the alogical inexplicable unconscious Māyā which obscures Consciousness.

Brahman or the Paramashiva has two aspects: the power of self-obscuration (Tirobhāva and anugraha) or the power of bestowing grace. By the formeı the real nature of things is obscured and thus the world is the result of this power of self-obscuration. By the latter power, the world of becoming gradually ceases and returns to its pristine essence or essential nature. Thus Tirobhava and Anugraha are the two termini of the whole process of becoming; here change or becoming is conceived not of Brahma or the Absolute light of Consciousness but in it the whole universe of matter, life and mind is already in subtle forms undistinguishable by name and form which comprise the pure order of Being oı Shuddha-vidyā tattva. In other words, the universe is Shiva-Shakti or Consciousness-power in essence. The universe emerges as the result of self-veiling of trans-empirical Consciousness. The Spanda-kārikā says 'Svarūpa Asvarūpeāropone-chāsya-shaktāyah-satato-tthitah", in other words its latent poweıs ever arise on account of its power of self-obscuration. The two chief functions of Māyā which is involved in the absolute light of self-conscious principle 'Parama-Shiva' are the functions of self-obscuration and self-polarisation. This is the principle of particulaıi-sation or the finitising principle by means of which material, vital and psychical forms emerge out of the womb of the formless Consciousness. Under the influence of Māyā, the self or the All-compre-hensive Experiencing Principle identifies itself with the 'Idam' or this which is its material counterpart. Subjectively viewed 'Māyā' indicates the sense of difference in all individual selves or 'Jivas'. Just as the surging waves hold in the sea, so she obstructs

the true nature of 'Atmā' or the self which but for her influence would otherwise remain unobscured (Māyā vibheda-budhir, nijāngsha jātesu-Nikhila-vāiveshu, nityaṃtasya Niraṇkushavibhavam Veleva varidhe rūṇdhe-yattava Sandoha Ch. V). In the 'Ishwara-Pratyavijna' Māyā has been spoken of 'that which is nothing but the notion of difference in things entertained by the subject self who in his true nature is pure undifferentiated Consciousness (Vhedabhireva Bhāveshu Krtur-bodhātmanópiyā Māyā-Shaktyeva sā vidyatyane, vidyeshvara yatha"—Ishwara-Pratyavijna—Ch. III". Thus subjectively, Māyā is the process of establishing dichotomy of subject and object in the unitary all-comprehensive absolute Experience. Objectively viewed, it is the intrinsic power in the absolute Experiencing principle or Experience which projects out the dynamic flow of psychical, vital and physical forms. Thus we see that the principle of Māyā' is regarded, in the first place as power or energy in its potential form involved in the Light of pure absolute Consciousness, a 'stress' in the first vibratory indeterminate, unconditioned Consciousness. But as it is a 'stress' it has the inherent tendency to shine forth and this universe which is 'māika' or empirical manifestation is the grosser or Kinetic aspect of the same principle of Māyā. In other words, Māyā as a mere potentiality or 'stress' is 'Chiṭ-sākti' identical with Consciousness, but Māyā as kinetic energy or manifested power is the universe of objective facts. As 'Chiṭ-sakti' it is spiritual in nature, for it is one with the absolute. As 'Māyā-sakti' it is the grosser aspect of spirit which is matter. Matter thus, according to 'Āgama-shāstra' is obscured spirit or Con-

sciousness, and the act of obscuration is done by Māyā as the intrinsic power of the absolute Experiencing principle. Its chief function is to obscure and thereby to delimit the all-comprehensive Experience in respect of the true nature of both what is experienced and the Experiencer or the Self himself. It has already been pointed out that in the level of 'Shuddha-vidyā', that is, the level of pure Experience, the germs of diversity remain as subtle potential forces which at the same time form a single unitary whole, in other words 'all-this' appears to be nothing but the Absolute. In this stage the self realises itself as being present as an indwelling informing and all-pervading principle in 'All-this', it is 'co-eval' with 'All-this', in other words 'Nityatva' or eternity is a character of the self. But under the influence of 'Māyā' this 'Nityattva' or eternity appears as temporal or as having limited duration, this is technically called 'Kāla'. In other words changelessness becomes change, 'Being' becomes the 'Becoming'. Thus in this stage, there is change in the all-comprehending Experiencing principle itself which due to the influence of Māyā has the experience of time emerging out of 'Māyā', this is known as 'Kāla-sākti' oı 'Time-poweı'. In this way according to 'Shaivāgama' the obscuring power of 'Māyā' acts as a veil upon the eternity of the all-comprehensive Experience which shines forth in the temporal. In the second place, the Omnipresence or all-pervasiveness of the 'All-this is mine', of the 'Suddhya-vidya-tattva' becomes restricted to limited space and has the experience of restricting conditions of cause, sequence, occasion and the like. Thus omnipresence both from the point of view of

presence in all-space and transcending all space is veiled. This is known as 'Niyati' or the power of Māyā-sākti which makes the all-pervading suddha-vidyā-tattva to experience spatial and positional relations. In other words, omnipresence is felt as limited. Thirdly, the all comprehensive experiencing principle which is at the same time all-perfect, in which there is no feeling of want or limitation because nothing remains outside of it, feels as being attached to some thing in particular and outside of itself. The feeling of all-completeness, or self-fulfilment which is known as 'Pūrnattva' is transformed into restless discontentment according as interest in one particular thing flags or moves on to another thing. This is technically known as 'Rāga'. Fourthly, the all-comprehending experiencing principle due to its all-pervasive character which is conscious of the whole of 'All-this' as belonging to itself has the experience of its omniscience being veiled by knowledge which is polarised into two distinct principles subject and object. In the 'Shiva-sutra-vimarsini' knowledge is regarded as a bondage (Jananṃ bandhah) or limiting factor. It has already been pointed out, in the previous chapter, that consciousness as 'Chiti' cannot be identified with knowledge; for in knowledge there must always be present Veda-Buddhi as differentiaton between the subject and the object of knowledge, 'Ahantā' and the 'Idantā'. When omniscience becomes manifested in knowledge which is nothing but limited consciousness, there is the emergence of 'Vidyā-Sakti' out of the womb of 'Māyā-sākti' and lastly, the sarva-kartittva or self's supreme power of acting freely becomes limited by Kāla-sakti which means free

action changing into restricted action, the all-creating power intrinsic in 'Suddha-Vidyā-tattava' is manifested in the power of limited creation by Kāla-sakti. In this way after the emergence of the 'Asuddhā-vidyā-tattva', when Māyā, the self-veiling power of the Self shines forth and comes into play, she brings into operation along with her five forms of limitations which have been technically called in the 'Agama shastra' the five 'Kanchukas' or the five forces of limitations, such as the 'Kāla', 'Niyati', 'Rāga', 'Vidyā', 'Kalā'. The term kanchuka literally means a sheath or veil. Thus Māyā-shakti along with her distinct latent powers of contraction or limitation is at the root of all creation; for creation is nothing but expansion or shining forth of the absolute light of the pure Consciousness. In other words, absolute Consciousness shines forth into the world of particulars and limited individuals and thus becomes subject to the five forms of the obscuring power of Māyā. The self thus loses its divine state and glory and by its own self-negating power projects itself out there into the world of matter, life and mind. Thus eternity 'Nityatvā' becomes delimitation, (parichhna) that is, productive of appearance and disappearance, homogeneity, and heterogeneity, life and death. This is done by the operation of time-power as 'Kāla' in the 'Tattva-sandoha' (Ch. V.II) 'Sā-Nityatā-sya-shāktī-nikrishya-nidhanodaya-pradānena, nityatā-parichhedakarī-Kaliptā-Syāṭ Kāla-tattva-rūpena'. In other words, Her power of eternity bifurcating Herself into life and death and which ever in cyclic order performs the function of delimitation is to be regarded as the 'Kāla-tattvā'. In other words, 'Time-power' or Kāla is neither

conceptional nor empirical but gives rise to them. It is the trans-empirical Time-power which being a tattva is itself indivisible (Akhanda-kāla) gives rise to time as effect as (Kāryya-kāla). This gross time with paits sakala-kāla intervenes in the creation of gross things like matter, life and mind. So it has been nicely said "Time leads me in time".

CHAPTER VII

THE EMERGENCE OF THE GROSS TATTVAS.

Both Shaiva and Sākta philosophy enumerate thirty-six tattvas. In all the Āgamas whether Shaiva or Sākta, the supreme light of Absolute Consciousness is not a tattva; for it is beyond all tattvas (Tattvātita). In Sanskrit, the term 'Tattva' denotes that which existing from eternity is the cause of enjoyment of all created beings. In the Sutasanhitā it has been enjoined, 'Āpralayaṃ yattisthati sarvesāṃ bhogadāyi bhutanaṃ Taṭ tattvamiti proktaṃ na shariraghatādi tattvamataḥ'. Further the word 'Taṭ' is derived from the root 'taṇ' with the prataya 'kvip' affixed to it. Now the root 'taṇ' signifies expansion or comprehension, so the word 'taṭ' denotes the all-comprehending absolute Reality, and the word 'tattva' connotes expresison or self-projection of that absolute Reality. Shri Kumar in his commentary on 'Tattva-prakasha' by vojadeva says, that which pervades all space and comprehends all time is known as tattva, 'Tatattvāṭ santatatvaniti tato biduḥ" Tatattvaṃ deshatoḥ vyāptiḥ santatattvancha kālataḥ'. The tattvas, it has already been shown, are broadly classified under two heads :—(1) the tattvas of the pure order of Being or Shuddhavidyā aspect of the ultimate Reality are Shiva-tattva, Sakti-tattva, Sadāśiva-tattva, Iswara-tattva and Saḍvidyā-tattva, (2) the mixed or Misra order of Being or the Shuddhā-Shuddha tattvas which constitute the Māyā tattva or the principle of self-obscuration, self-multipli-

cation and self-limitation intrinsically bound up with the pure light of absolute Consciousness or Parā-samvit along with its five-fold powers viz. Kalā, Kāla, Niyati, Vidyā and Rāga. The function of Kalā is to delimit the unlimited power of the (Sarvakartrittva) supreme Reality, the function of Kāla or Time-power is to divide (Parichchheda) what is indivisible and unlimited, the function of Niyati is to restrict and regulate the all-Comprehending Experience under conditions of cause, sequence, occasion, the function of Vidyā is to reduce the all-Knower into a little knower, and the function of Rāga is to produce interest in followed by attachment to objects in that which is all-perfect (Purnāhantā). It is to be noted that Māyā-tattva stands mid-way between the Pure order of Being and the Impure order of Being; (3) the Impure order of Being or the Ashuddha tattva. It comprises the Purusa tattva and Prakriti tattva. It has already been pointed out that continuity (Vimarshá) and integrity (Swatantra) are the main characteristics of the ultimate Reality which is the absolute pure light of Consciousness. The Āvasa process describes the way how the one absolute Consciousness blossoms forth into a real world of finite minds and material objects. The Parā-samviṭ or Pure Consciousness is self-luminous (Prakāsá) as well as self-conscious (Vimarsá). It transcends the universe (Viśvottirna) as well as all-comprehensive (Viśvātmaka). Just as fire is the synthetic unity of light and heat, similarly pure Parā-Samviṭ is the synthesis of the universal Ahantā and Swantantra or unrestricted freedom (chiti swatantrā viswa siddhi hetū). This unrestricted freedom in Chaitanya or absolute Consciousness

is its intrinsic dynamism and though in perfect identity with Chaitanya (chaitanyamayee), yet acts as the 'Nisus' of its blossoming forth into the universe of manifold objects. It should be noted here that according to Shaiva Philosophy though the Absolute shines forth into infinite variety, it remains in its pristine identity of essence. In the pure order of universal manifestation which forms the first flutter of absolute Consciousness, its spiritual aspect predominates over its material aspects, whereas in the second stage the material aspects or the aspect of self-obscuration, of self-abnegation, of self-differentiation prevails. In this stage, the Purnāhantā or the pure Self is enveloped by Māyā with its five fold powers.

The Purusa Tattva

The universal 'I' becomes the empirical individual self which is known as Purusa tattva. The Purusa tattva or the individualised Self emerges as a result of the obscurating and differentiating power of Māyā along with the six Kanchukas or limiting powers. Thus Māyā-sakti with her delimiting powers brings into existence the individual self. It is to be remembered here, as already explained in the previous chapter, that the individualised self is the self-same supreme Self who without undergoing any real change or transformation in himself remaining as He is in himself comprehending all His various stages of evolution becomes the Purusa tattva according to the 'Ābhasa' Process. Thus Purusa is Atmā or the Self subject to Māyā-sakti and the other limiting saktis or powers which inseparably inhere in the Self. In Saivāgama chan-

gelessness and change, identity and differentiation do not contradict each other. They are, on the other hand, the two aspects of one and the same Supreme light of Absolute Consciousness. Now, by the operation of Māyā-sakti, the Absolute blossoms forth into an infinite number of Purusas or individualised selves without being diminished in any way or without undergoing any change in essence, as it is the inexhaustible fountain-head of 'all-this''. Here the absolute Experiencer or the Supreme Self, experiences Himself as an endless number of individual selves or Purusas. Just as the infinite number of sparks of fire are in essence same as fire and at the same time its innumerable differentiations or individuations; similarly the infinite number of Purusas are essentially the Supreme Self though apparently differentiated into a plurality of selves. The 'Yoga-Vāsista' says 'Svamarichivaladvhuta Yalitāgney kanāḥ iva, Sarbāḥ evotthitaḥ Rama Brahmanaḥ Jivahrāshayaḥ'. In other words 'Oh! Rama, just as out of flaming fire innumerable sparks gushe forth, similarly all particularised individuals issue out of the one Absolute Brahman'. It is to be noted here that this process of self-multiplication and self-differentiation is in reality the operation of Māyā-Sakti which emerges after the pure order of universal manifestation and which not only obscures but also differentiates. This is why the individual selves realise themselves as mutually exclusive entities and independent of one another, just as all material objects are regarded as separate and different from one another, though 'what is constitutive of matter is not small particles but centres of force

or power or sakti'. Further according to Shaiva philosophy, the Purusa constitutes the entire universe of psychical, biological and physical objects. Purusa tattva is not merely confined to man but also is applicable to every individual or particular thing. For matter, life and mind are but in essence the same Absolute light of Consciousness obscured and multiplied in different degrees. They do not differ in kind but in the degree of self-obscurating power of the Supreme Self. They are the same spirit veiling itself in different degrees displaying the same nature of the Supreme Self. In other words, that which ever is the pure light of Consciousness later becomes mind, life and matter and hence nothing is essentially or in essence material or physical. Thus every particle of matter be it 'Atom', 'Electron' or 'Ion' is a Purusa Identifying itself with the solid crust of matter which is the 'Prithivi tattva' and which is the gross manifestation of subtler products which emanate out of the World-ground which is Consciousness 'Chitiḥ svatantrā viswa siddhi hetu'. Finally the Purusas do not merely mean, in Shaiva philosophy, individualised persons. Every single thing in the universe is a Purusa. Thus an 'Atom' is a Purusa identified with solidity. The Purusas are, therefore, like points in a straight line forming a continuum. They are like mathematical points having position wthout any magnitude or dimension. Hence they have been described as 'Anu' or atomic in character. They are not anything with a limited extension; for limitation of an omnipresent, eternal Being like the Paramashiva or the pure light of Absolute Consciousness which is non-spatial

(Niskala) in character is inconceivable in any other sense. In short, they being centres of force cannot have any material dimension. 'Pürnattvābhābena paɪimitattvaṭ anuttvṃ'—Pratabhijñā vṛitti III ii.4-Utpalācharya. It is worthy of mentioning here that the Purusa tattva as given in Āgama philosophy and in Sānkhya philosophy are quite different. In the Sānkhya system the Puɪusa is regarded as the ultimate reality beyond which there is nothing. But in Shaivāgama, the Purusa tattva is but a grosser aspect of the more subtler aspects of the Paramashiva. Purusa in Shaiva-sākta philosophy is the Shiva obscured and multiplied by Māyā and delimited by her six Kañchukas or six limiting powers as described above. As individualised units or centres of force or power they pervade the entire universe.

The Prakriti tattva and the Gunas.

According to the Shaīvāgama in the Suddha-viddya tattva the two sides of all-perfect Experience the 'I' and the 'This' 'Aham' and 'Idam' remain in a balanced form, and though they are felt as forming an identity, yet the experiencing subject realises the 'This' or object of experience as 'my' and 'mine'. In ordinary everyday life and experience there is the feeling of identity of one's own self with one's own thoughts, feelings and volitions, yet there is also the realisation of 'All-this' as mine. The Purusa and Prakriti are nothing but the delimited expressions of the universal 'I' and 'the universal 'All-this' aspects of the Shuddhavidya state. The 'this' or the objective counterpart of unitary Experience which is distinctly and clearly realised in the Suddha-

vidya state is indistinctly and vaguely realised as indefinite 'something'. This vague indefinite 'something' is no other than the universal 'All-this' 'Sarvam Idam' on account of the obscurating and delimiting powers of Māyā and expressing itself as a vague indefinite 'something' as object of Purusa's experience forming the ground of all his future experiences. This is 'Prakriti' as forming the form and potency of all creations both in the form of experience as well as in the form of the experienced. The word 'Pra' means before or the indefinite background which is prior to all well-defined clear-cut experience and the word 'Kriti' which means expression connotes what we mean by 'Prakriti'. 'Prakriti' is thus the vague indefinite objective basis of all future experience of the 'Purusa'. It is evident that Prakriti is the contracted experience of the Purusa who is the same transcendental self but whose powers have been obscured and delimited. It has already been shown that in the Ishvra-tattva of the Suddha-vidyā order, the whole universe as the Self is present to the Self and thus Sakti in Ishvra does not undergo any limitation or modification ; but in the Purusa-tattva there is such modification. This is done by Māyā-sakti or Kāla-sakti which gives birth to Prakriti as an indefinite vague objectivity distinct from Purusa. Prakriti here exists as a mere general objectivity which becomes particularised in particular objects when the equilibrium of the gunas which constitute Prakriti is disturbed. When Māyā-sakti intervenes bifurcating the 'Ahaṃ' and 'Idaṃ' which together form the all-comprehensive unitary Experience, the homogeneity is broken up and instead of the all-pervading homo-

geneous whole, we have the experience of a heterogeneous universe of objects. Thus Kāla-sakti which is Māyā-sakti itself delimits the unlimited Jnana-sakti, Ichha-sakti and Kriyá-sakti of the Supreme Self and transforms Him into the Purusa tattva. It is to be noted here that without the emergence of Prakriti there can be no Purusa. For a Purusa is only the contracted form of the 'All-Experiencer' and as such it cannot exist without any relations. In the Suddha-vidya tattva or the pure order of being, the relations are of universal nature, while in the Purusa-tattva stage they become necessarily limited and contracted. Now relations always presuppose the distinct existence of the terms to be related. Thus for the shining forth of the Purusa as a Being with relations there must be the Prakriti-tattva coming into manifestation simultaneously with the Purusa. Thus Purusa and Prakriti are simultaneously manifested and are also inseparable. It is evident that Purusa and Prakriti are nothing but contracted, obscured and delimited manifestations of the universal-Aham and the universal-Idam or 'All-this' aspects respectively of the Suddha-vidya state. It is a fact beyond dispute that all manifestations or expressions are characterised by a dual aspect. We speak of positive and negative electricity, of potential and kinetic energy or in the domain of man of masculinity and femininity, though the one is co-implicate of the other. To-day modern science has proved to the hilt that the dual role of the electron as a unit of matter and a unit of electricity simply describes different manifestations of one and same Reality. If matter sheds its mass and travels with the speed of light, we speak of radiation

or energy and when the energy conjeals and becomes apparently inert, we speak of matter. Similarly Purusa and Prakriti are simultaneous manifestations of the universal 'I' and the universal 'All-this' which togethei constitute the all-comprehensive unitaiy Experience. The Purusa is the contracted form of the 'All-Experiencer' obscured by His own 'Māyā-sakti' or Self obscurating, Self-multiplying power, and Prakriti is the same universal 'All-this' in the form of 'something' indefinite and vague. Further as the Purusas are many because of the self multiplying power of Māyā-sakti, similarly the Prakritis are also infinite in number, one for each Purusa, the one universal 'All-this' being perceived dimly by the different Purusas as so many different 'this-es' as different persons may perceive the same Sun in so many different reflections in different portions of the sea. 'Evaṃ kinchiṭ kaṛtrittvaṃ yaṭ māyā kāryaṃ tattra kinchiṭtvavishistaṃ yat kaṛtrittvaṃ visheyam, tattra vayapriyamānā kalā vidyādiprasavaheturiti nirúpitam. Idaniṃ vishsanavago yaḥ kinchiditvukṭo jneyah kāryancha, taṃ yavaṭ sā kalā svātmanaḥ pṛthak kurute tāvadesa eva sukhaduḥkha-mohātṃaka-voggya-vishesānu-sýutasya sāmānyamāttrsya tatgunasāmyāparah naṃnaḥ prakrititattvasya sargaḥ-iti voktri-vogyayugalasya samameva kalātattvattāḥsṛistiḥ-Tantrasāra Āhn. 8. Srimat Avinavaguptāchārya also in this 'Tantrāloka' Ahn. 9 says :

"samameva hi vogyaṃ cha vokṭāraṃ cha prasūyate
kalā vedāvisaṃdhānādaviyuktaṃ parasparaṃ
Evaṃ saṃvedyamāttrṃ yaṭ sukha-duhkhavimohatah
votṣyate yattatah proktaṃ taṭsāmyātṃakamāditah".

In other words, prakriti is the delimited contracted form of 'sarvaṃ Idaṃ' or universal 'All-this' holding the Gunas as a parallelogram of forces or energies appearing simultaneously with the Purusas and indefinitely and vaguely perceived as being the form and potency of pleasure, pain and ignorance. Just as, by virtue of Māyā-sakti, the Self delimits and multiplies itself in an infinite number of Purusas, similarly and simultaneously the same self in the form of 'All-this' Experience by the same power delimits and multiplies itself into an infinite series of 'this-es'. It is worthy of mentioning here that according to Sānkhya philosophy, Prakriti is one and all for all the Purusas but according to Shaivāgama there are innumerable Prakritis as there are innumerable Purusas. The Purusas in the Trika system are just like Leibnitzian 'Monāds' each perceiving the universe in its own way. Further the classical Sānkhya philosophy posits a plurality of Purusas representing the formless Consciousness with one unconscious Prakriti which is the form and potency of all creative activity; but in Shaivasākta philosophy, Prakriti is neither an unconscious nor really independent principle. Purusa and Prakriti, the form and potency of all gross subjective and objective manifestations respectively are but the off-spring of the common finitising principle viz. Māyā-sakti which is the Vimarsa-sakti of the absolute Consciousness. The dualism as well as duality of Purusa and Prakriti are explained as being the emanations of one and the same ultimate Reality; otherwise the Sruti viz. 'All-this' is verily 'Brahman', (Sarvaṃ Khalvidaṃ Brahma) is contradicted. Thus Prakriti being the shining forth of the absolute

Consciousness cannot be an independent principle nor unconscious as the Sānkhya system holds. Prakriti is thus the same Chit-sakti of Paramashiva obscuring and multipling itself with its own power of Māyā-sakti. It has already been stated that Purusa and Prakriti come into manifestation only when the 'All-Experiencer' assumes a sleeping aspect or self-obscurating aspect at every successive moment of time i.e. to say when Eternity bifurcates itself into an infinitie series of instants. Eternity is beyond all time as well as comprehends all instants of time and succession. In the pure light of absolute Consciousness which is Eternity itself (Nitya), time-power or Kāla sakti remains as a mere potentiality, there is as yet no experience of time as succession of moments. The process therefore of the manifestation of Purusa and Prakriti be described as the process of evolution of the ultimate Reality or Paramashiva being more and more involved in obscurating sleep. Now evolution and involution, 'Unmesh and Nimesh' being but the two poles of the pure light of absolute Consciousness which is a Continuum becomes involved into a continuous process of self-creation, of self-ingression, self-obscuration and self-multiplication. And thus by involving itself produces not a single limited unit merely, but a multiplicity of such units or Purusas, and the Purusas thus not only become many but also mutually exclusive. The infinite number of Purusa-Prakriti twins limit each other and exclude each other. In this stage the 'All-Experiencer' falls asleep, as it were, and realises His true nature the 'I' as vague indistinct 'somebody' involved in sleep. This stage may be compared to a person

just on the eve of falling into sound sleep having a vague indefinite awareness of himself. This is the subjective side of the All-Comprehensive unitary Experience. Similarly on the objective side the 'All-comprehensive Experience' appears as vague indefinite 'something'. And as there is only a general sentiency of a vague indefinite 'something', Prakriti is called the generally-experienced, the basis of all sentiency (Taḍeva Prakriti tattavaṃ tu bhogyasāmānyaṃ—Tantrasāra, Ahn. 8). Further the experience of Prakriti or Bhogyasāmānya which is sentiency in general in Purusa being a state of slumber, there can be no specific distinct feeling or sentiency of any sort whatsoever. In other words it is a state of equilibrium of discursive awareness, the active feeling of moving interest and the passive and inert feeling of dull stupefaction. In other words, Prakriti tattva being the equilibrium of all affective sentiency or feelings is the presentation of a vague indefinite 'something' in which all the distinct features of the infinite contents of the universal 'All-this' are obliterated, there can be nothing which can generate in the Purusa or subject-self any such specific feelings such as 'Sukha' or pleasure, pain or 'Dukha' and delusion or 'Moha'. Now the feelings of pleasure, pain and delusion are produced by the gunas of Prakriti which are called technically the Sattva, the Rajas and the Tamas. When they are in a state of equipoise or in a state of tension as it were, there is the general sentiency of a vague indefinite 'something' which is the Prakriti tattva. It is to be noted here that the word 'Guna' in the Sākta-Sáiva philosophy represents a gross form of

the universal Will-power, Creative power and the power of Knowing pure and simple without any reference to emotional feeling or will and thus gunas do not mean attributes or qualities as understood in western parlance. Literally they mean three threads of a chord or constitutive elements of Prakriti tattva. From Prakriti the process of limited manifestation differentiates into the grosser tattvas of Buddhi, Ahankāra and Manas etc.

The third or the material stage of the evolution of Prakriti commences with the emergence of 'Antaḥkarana' which is the unity of Manaḥ, Ahaṇkara and Buddhi. An analysis of the psychical process technically called 'Antaḥkarana' in its three distinct phases will not be out of place here. When we say, we apprehend something or perceive something as 'this or that', a very complicated process is involved, though we may not be deliberately conscious of it. The following processes clearly indicate the various phases of our knowing or perceiving a thing. In the first place, our senses come in contact with an external stimulus awakening sensation technically called 'Ālochana'. Now what is presented by senses is a mere manifold. The senses must be supplemented by the co-operation of something before they can act at all. There may be the whole universe of objects acting upon the senses, yet there can be no sensation if there be not the operation of the mind. Thus mind or Manaḥ is the factor which emerges simultaneously with the presentation of the manifold of sense. The function of Manaḥ is selecting a certain group to the exclusion of others out of the chaotic flux of the manifold

of sense with a view to curving out a partĩcular image. In the 'Tantrāloka' the function of Manaḥ is described as 'Vavaccheda' i.e. tc divide or to select. Vāchaspati Mishra also speaks of the function of Manaḥ as 'Vavachchidaṇ manas lakhayati'; thus for example when I stand on a green meadow, I am affected by sensation of all kinds aroused by the beautiful scenery, the blue sky, the green colour of the meadow, the singing of birds etc. but if I am asked, 'bring me the cow' I have to select out of the manifold of sense affecting me from all sides only those pertaining to the cow which is sought for with a view to curve out the single image of a cow out of the selected group of sensations. Now this is a function which is quite different from the operation of a mere sensation. This function of 'Image-making' has been called by Kant, the great German philosopher 'synthetic apperception'. Further this 'Image-making' process will not enable me to think of or to speak of the object of my present perception which is merely an image as a real cow objectively out there on the green field. What I am actually perceiving is a mere colour-form streched out in space taking a particular shape or image but in order to transform the image or inner picture, it must be endowed with solidity, life and so on. These properties are not given by the sense of sight. They are supplied by memory or by past personal experience stored up in my memory as a particular individual cow oı object. Now my personal experience is *in me* i.e. something of myself. Memory is possible only when there is a sense of personal identity. For it is not possible to think of or to speak of the present object as a particular cow unless I feel it

something as part of myself and in me. In short it is to be referred to what is already 'me' and 'mine'. This is the process of assimilation or mental co-ordination (Anusandhana) but this is not all. There must be a comparison of the present experience with similar experiences of past not only but there must be reference of this particular cow-image to the species 'cow', before I am able to say that this particular object is an individual cow belonging to the species called 'cow'. The question, is, 'whence do I derive the idea of a species', for I have no such personal experience of the species 'cow' but only experience of individual cow or cows. There must, therefore, be a *standard of reference* which is beyond personal experience. This reference to a standard is the fourth stage in our experience of or thinking of or speaking of an object of perception as 'this is a cow' and not any other thing. All these above phases or aspects of experience are in one word called 'Antaḥkarana' which is the unity of Manah, Ahankara and Buddhi. It is evident that from the standpoint of Shaiva and Sākta philosophy, Manas is what constructs particular images out of the manifold of sensations supplied by the senses and assimilates, co-ordinates and synthesises the chaotic discrete flux of sensations into mental images. Ahaṅkāra is the agency through which experiences are stored up in the form of memory in the abysmal depth of the personal self and assimilates the present experiences with the past with a sense of personal identity. In so far as this 'I' is the personal 'I', it is nothing but the sum total of experiences past and present. Ahaṅkāra is thus the 'Tattva' which superimposes the personal 'I' upon the impersonal Paramashiva

or the real Self. As it has been stated 'Ahaṅkāro Yena buddhipratibimbite vedyasaṅparke kaluse puṅprakāshe anātmni atmābhimanaḥ shukṭau rajatābhimānabaṭ. Ata eva 'Kāra' ityanena kritakattvṃ asyukttaṃ. Sānkhyasya tu tanṇa yujjate, sa hi na ātmanḥ ahaṅvimarshamayatāmichhti; vyam tu katrittvamati tasya ichhāmaḥ. Taṭcha suddhaṃ vimaısha eva smattvachamṭkārarupaḥ ahaṃ iti'.—Tantrasarā Āhn. 8. Lastly 'Buddhi' being the supplier of that standard of reference which is not given in experience but which is essentially necessary for interpretation or for the formation of judgment serves also as the 'tattva' through which concrete expeıiences are taken up for such reference and comparison. It may thus be spoken of as the super-personal state of consciousness in a limited self. Hence in the trika system, 'Buddhi' is spoken of as the memory of Shuddha-vidya experience in a limited form. This Buddhi tattva may be compared to the sub-conscious self. In the language of Wa.d it is, 'what we are when we are gradually swooning away in perfectly dreamless sleep and what we are as we gradually rise up to the threshold of consciousness'. 'Buddhi' thus may be called the subliminal or sub-conscious self or the memory of the Shuddha-vidyā tattva but later on transformed into a dim indefinite impersonal subconscious self. As such it is the unruffled consciousness without the manifestation of any moving passion oı interest or inert passivity. Hence it has been held in Shaiva and Sākta Philosophy as due to the emergence of the 'Sattvaguna' of Prakriti. It has already been pointed out that Prakriti is here conceived of as the equilibrium of the three gunas viz. Sattva, Rajas

and Tamas representing its three stages of expression, activity and inhert passivity held in a state of tension. Due to the predominance of Sattva guna when the equipoise of Prakriti tattva is disturbed, Buddhi emerges. The Sattva guna being the dominating factor, Buddhi connotes the affection of the Purusa tattva as the unmoving feeling of mere presentation, it is in other words the Prakasha aspect of Prakriti or the impersonal subconscious self in which there is bare awareness of object. This is Nirvikalpajñana. In such a stage of pure intelligence, the feeling is one of bliss without any tinge of moving passion or interest. Further as this experience of buddhi is one in which there is bare awareness of mere existence (Sattā-mātra) without any thought of 'I' or ego on the part of the experiencer or any moving passion or interest, it may be called the impersonal subconscious self. From buddhi the above mentioned 'Ahaṅkāra' tattva emerges in which there is the realisation of the experiencer as a particular person. In other words, it is the self-same subconscious impersonal self manifested as the personal self in which there is the experience of 'I am so and so', 'I am this body', 'this aggregate of the processes of thought, of cognition, cōnation and volition'. It thus represents the stage of personifying of what was non-personal, the impersonal Self taking name and form. It is this 'Ahaṅkāra' tattva which holds together the ingredients of namarūpa making up a personal being. Here the Rajas guna of Prakriti tattva is the dominating factor in which the two other gunas are held in a more or less subdued form. And lastly as explained above from Ahaṅkāra the manas is manifested. The function

of manas is the construction of images out of the manifold of sense impressions. At this stage Tama guna is the dominant and determining factor and sattva and Rajas guna lie in a more or less dormant stage. It is the gross manifestation of the personal self as embodied, "Tasya kriya tamomaya mūrtih manas uchyate vikalpkaro-Tattva Sandoha. 15".

But it is to be noted that Manaṣ is not the only product of Ahaṅkāra but also two other groups of tattvas are manifested out of it, generally called Indriyas. It is to be noted here that in Shaiva and Sākta philosophy by the word 'Indriyas' is not only meant the physical organs of seeing, of hearing, of smelling, of tasting and tactual sensation and the so-called muscular sense and the bodily organ of action, but also those powers of Purusa tattva as endowed with and manifesting these faculties which exhibit themselves as operating through these physical organs. The Acharyas of Shaiva and Sākta philosophy consider the 'All-This' experience of Parama Shiva or the Pure light of Absolute Consciousness as consisting of a number of Bhubanas or planes of matter, life and consciousness made up of tattvas. Thirty six tattvas are recognised out of which twenty five tattvas enumerated from below constitute the Asuddha, gross aspect. They are (36) the Earth technically called the Prithivī or Dharā-tattva, (35) Water, technically Ap or the principle of liquidity, (34) Fire, technically Tejas or the form evolving principle, (33) Air, technically Vāyu or the principle of aeriality, (32) Sky, technically called Ākāsha the principle of Vacuity. These five principles collectively are called the Paṇcha Bhūtas or

the five material principles (31) the Sense-object of Odour as it is in itself the 'Gandha-taṇmātra'. (30) the Sense-object of Salivation as it is in itself or technically called 'Rasa-tanmātra', (29) the Sense-object of form as it is in itself Rupa taṇmātra, (28) the Sense-object of feeling as it is in itself 'Sparsha-taṇmātra', (27) The Sense-object of sound as it is in itself oı technically called 'Shabda-taṇmātra'. These five principles from the general object of the special senses called the Taṇmātıas. (26) the generative organ technically called 'Upastha' or the power of generation or recreation, (25) the evacuating organ technically called 'Pāyu' or the power of evacuation, (24) the feet technically called the 'Pāda' the power of moving, (23) the Hand technically called 'Pāni' the powei of holding, (22) the Vocal organ technically called 'Vāch' or the power of making sound, these five are collectively called the 'Karmendriyas' or the faculties of activities, (21) the faculty of smell technically called 'Ghrānendriya, (20) the faculty of taste technically called 'the Rasanendriya', (19) the faculty of sight technically called 'Darshanendriya', (18) the faculty of feeling by touch technically called 'Sparshendriya', (17) the faculty of hearing technically called 'Shṛvanendriya', these five are collectively called the five 'Jñānendriyas' or the faculty of sense perception, (16) the faculty of image-making technically called the 'Manas', (15) 'Ahaṇkāra' or the faculty of constructing or evolving the personal ego or the empirical self of every day life as Ram, Sham, Jadu etc., (14) the faculty of judging or interpretation or 'Buddhi' tattva. These three faculties are collectively called the 'Antaḥkarana' or the inner organ,

(13) the 'All-Experiencer' with this powers delimited, the universal individualised or the 'Purusa-Tattva', (12) the 'Prakriti-Tattva' or the form and potency of all creation, the parallelogram of the three gunas viz. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. The vague, undefined and indefinite 'All-this' presented to the Purusa through the influence of Māyā and as such the root and foundation of all future experience. It is evident that from the 'Prithivi-Tattva' down to 'Prakriti-Tattva' we have twenty five Tattvas forming the impure or 'Ashuddha' order of Being.

(11) the Second which constitutes the pure-impure order of Being technically called 'Shuddha-Ashuddha' Tattvas is the Māyā Tattva and her six limiting powers, such as (10) Kalā or the limited creative power of the 'All-this' Experiencer in the individual, (9) limited omniscience of the universal Experiencer in the individual, (8) Rāga or delimited attachment to something in particular arising out of dissatisfaction according as interest in one-thing changes to another, (7) Niyati or the principle of delimited All-comprehensiveness, (6) Kāla or delimited all-pervasiveness in the individual. The above Tattvas collectively constitute the five Kanchukas or enveloping sheaths of the Purusa. The so-called five Kanchukas or sheaths, it is to be noted here, are the five eternal Śaktis or powers of 'Paramashiva' in a limited form. The 'Māyā-Tattva' or the self-obscurating power of 'Paramashiva' serves as a veil upon His omnipotence, omniscience, self-satisfaction, eternity and unrestricted freedom. The universal self as enveloped by Māyā' with her five delimiting powers or Śaktis appears as Purusa with

delimited action, knowledge, contentment, eternity and restricted freedom.

The third order of Being or 'Suddha-Vidyā' Tattva constitutes (5) the 'Sad-vidya-Tattva' or the 'Tattva which leads to the realisation of diversity in-Unity-and-identity in which there is the experience of 'I am all this' and 'All-this', is mine. This stage represents equality in the presentation of the subjective and objective elements in consciousness. The first or the pure order of Being, it is to be remembered here, is the germinal stage (Bijāvasthā) of the supreme Absolute light of Consciousness in which 'Kāla-Sakti' or Time-Power remains merged as latent power and consequently there is no outward manifestation or external projection. The 'this side' and 'I side' of Absolute Experience form a unity as it were. (4) the 'Ishwara-Tattva' or the Tattva of realising what constitutes the lordliness and glory of the divine Being. According to Utpalācharya due to the emergence of Kriyā-Sakti or action the pure 'Self' appears as Īshwara (Udriktakriyāsaktirīshwaraḥ) (3) The 'Śadāshiva-Tattva' or the principle of Being i.e. 'That' from which or in which the experience of Being begins, (2) The 'Sakti Tattva' or the principle of negation, and (1) the 'Shiva Tattva' or the pure 'I' devoid of any feeling or awareness of 'I am'.

CHAPTER VIII

Conclusion

In a previous chapter, it has already been pointed out that in the supreme transcendental quiescent state of Absolute Consciousness or Paramashiva 'Vimarsa-Sakti' lies unmanifested and therefore remains one with Paramashiva. In this eternal Quiescence there arises a metaphysical point or 'stress' 'Prathama-Spandana' or Bindu which is concentrated Sakti or which constitutes the form and potency of all creation shining forth into the infinite centres of forces. This shining forth of the supreme quiescent Consciousness in the form of a stress or Bindu is the cause of all manifestation. This Bindu which is regarded as Shiva-Sakti Tattva is the cause of manifested Vyakta Sabda, Arthá or object and Pratyaya or cosmic Ideation constituting the manifested universe and which emerges out of the womb of the Bindu on its differentiation due to the preponderance of Will-to-create, Ichcha Sakti or Kriyā Sakti. The Shārada Tilaka says, "Kriyā Sakti Pradhānāyāh Sabda Sabdārtha Kāranaṃ Prakriterbindurūinyāh Śabdabrahmabhavaṭ araṃ". Thus universal manifestation according to Sāiva-Sākta philosophy takes three directions: (1) the universe as constituted by Sabda (Shabda-prabhaba), (2) the Arthá aspect or the cosmic stuff which is Prakriti-Sakti or the root cause of all objectivity, and (3) the Pratya aspect or the casual stress in terms of Pratya or the cosmic Ideation. It is to be noted here that the primitive Parā-sabda which emerges out of the

womb of Bindu is not sound but a state of agitation in the cosmic Bindu. This is Parā-Sabda which reveals itself in man as Arthá or object, Pratyaya or mental comprehension and Shabda or manifested sound. This primordial Nāda or Shabda or Parā-Vāk is the apriori indispensable condition of all manifestation or creation which is said to be Shabda-Prabhava. Ashabda Jagaṭ oı a universe of objects which is not manifested by sounds and sounds which are not rays or manifestations of Parā-Shabda is a contradiction in terms. Ancient grammaıians like Acharyya Bhatrihari arrived at the same conclusion in saying that "Sarvva-Śhabda-rūpatayā Sarva Sabdopagrāhyatayā ca Śabdatattvaṃ Abhidhīyate"—Vyākyapadiya. It is to be noted here that because the one Bindu or concentrated cosmic power shines forth in three fold forms that Shabda, Arthá and Pratyaya are intrinsically and inseparably related as forming one whole. Thus the absolute as Parā-Shabda or Shabdabrahman gradually shines forth in countless finite centres of multifarious finite experiences of name and form. From it issue all particular shabdas both Varnātmaka or lettered sounds and Dhvanyātmaka or unlettered sounds. It is evident that Bindu is the form and potency of two lines of evolution, the objective order (Arthá) and sound order or Sabda order. In Saiva-Sākta philosophy Parama Shiva is pure illumination Prakāsamātra, merged in Him is His Vimarsha or Swantra-Sākti. In the famous Tāntrik text "Kāmakalāvilāsa" by Puṇyānandanātha, the supreme Bindu is described as "Sakalabhubanādayasthitilayamayalīlābinodanodyuktah ı Antarlīnabimarsah pātu mahesah prakashamátra tanuḥ" ıı

In the yantras, Paramashiva being both Prakāsamātra and Vimarsa Sakti is also called 'Devi Tripurāsundrī or KāmaKāmeswarī'. In other words, She who by her irresistible perfect free will brings into existence by her five powers of Creation, Preservation, absorption which imply Nirodha and Anugraha, evolution and involution brings into existence out of the fulness of joy within the world of fact-section and the world of Sabda or Sabda prabhaba. Evolution and involution therefore represent the two aspects, Vimarsha and Prakāsha forming a synthesis and this synthetic unity bifurcates itself due to Kāma Kalā or Hardakalā into Visarga which represent Parā Sabda constituted by A-Ha beginning with A which represents Anuttarakalā. As it is said in Sivasūttravimarshinī (A-iti anuttaraprathamakalā akulasvarūpa pūrnāhantā). Hence by Anuttara-lipi is implied the letter before which there is no other i.e. the letter 'A'. By Vimarsha-lipi is meant the last letter 'HA'. By the union of 'A' and 'HA' the pure 'I' becomes visible. (Anuttararūpānuttara-vimarśhalipilakṣya-vigraha). In other words, the pure 'I-ness' (Ahamātmika) within whom are the letters of all alphabets is the form and potency of all letters. (Antar-garbhita-samasta-varṇakadaṁbaka). Beginning with A-kara and ending with Ha-kara the form of Vimarsha-sakti is constituted by fifty letters. (Akārādi-hakārānta-paṇcasaḍakṣara-rūpinī). Thus the Vimarsha-sakti of Prakasamātra Paramashiva is the matrix of all the universe of Sabda and Artha. "A-kārah sarva-varṇagryah Prakāśah Paramaḥ Sivaḥ, Ha-kārono'tyaḥ kalārūpo vimarśākhyah prakirtitaḥ. In the 'Kāma-Kalā-Vilāsha' which is an authoritative

Tantrik text, the lord Paramashiva who is mere Prakāsa is one with his vimarsha sakti which is visphurana-sakti or the stress towards shining forth. So it is said in Pratyavhijnā, "she is sphurattā or the primitive impulse towards manifestation. In Sākta philosophy, Siva is called the white Bindu and Sakti is called Red Bindu who form a continuum of being and becoming, of expansion and contraction. The two Bindus therefore in unison with each other are the cause of Vāk which comprises 'Parā', 'Pásyantī', 'Madhyamā', and 'Vaikharī' as well as the 36 tattvas or metaphysical principles. It is to be noted in this connection that in Saiva and Sākta philosophy, 'A-kāra' is the first letter and is Prakāsa or self-luminous Paramashiva but this is lakṣanārtha, in other words after the universe is manifested the first letter A indicates the Brahman or the Absolute but the Brahmasvrūpa is 'A-varna' i.e. unlettered, uncoloured, and undifferentiated Power which manifests itself as particular letters and particular objects of the universe. Thus Vāk or Word is in the form of Varna Pada and Mantra (Varnapadamantrarūpa) and its meaning and Artha is Kalā, Tattva and Bhuvana (Kalātattvabhuvanātmā). Thus out of Prakāsa and Vimarsa which are Sabda (Vāk) and Artha respectively, the whole universe originate. They are always united and not accidentally or mechanically related like a jar and picture which may be put together. If the union were merely accidental or mechanical, then the world of order and harmony could never come into existence. These two aspects of Paramashiva or Absolute light of Pure Consciousness shines forth into the three fold rays of creation,

maintenance and dissolution as the "Kāma-Kalā-Vilāsha" says

"Vāgarthau nitoiayutau paraṣparaṃ Śiva Sakti-
mayabetau

Srṣtisthitilayavedau tridhā bibaktau trivījarūpena"
—Kamakalāvilasā—12.

By creation is here meant the appearance of all the Tattvas beginning with Siva and ending with 'Kshiti', 'Kshiti' signifinies maintenance and dissolution ; is the reunion with or retreat to that essence in which they are essentially one (Svātmasāksāṭkāra). Achārya Avhinavagupta in his 'Tantrāloka' says "Svāṭmvah sṛṣtisaṃhāraḥ Svarūpattvena Saṃsthitah" i.e. these three functions are from, in and into the Atmā in their own nature. The identity of these two Prakāsha and Vimarsa is eternal (Nittvaṃ) like that of fire and its burning sakti or power. We may thus arrive at the inevitable conclusion that in Saiva, Sākta, Vyākarana Philosophy of Non-dualism the universe is not unreal but is essentially real i.e. real in its essence or Vimarsa sakti and the Supreme light of Absolute Consciousness is not a threadbare residium of logical chopping or abstract thinking. The self or the Atmaṇ or the 'I' is the Supreme light of Absolute Consciousness, the Supreme Lord 'Paiameswara'. Idam is the objective visible universe. The Supreme in his pristine glory is with the univeise within himself, therefore the sruti 'Sa aikshata' means that Paramashiva or Paramātma having seen the universe in Himself for Himself as Himself did not see any other i.e. He saw nothing outside Himself

because all things are involved in Him. He appeared to Himself as his own Self as 'I am the universal form'. In other words, 'I am the Experience which is continuous (Akhaṇḍa), massive (Ghana), Being (Sat), Consciousness (Cit) and Bliss (Ānanda).—Akhaṇḍasaccidānandaghanātmānubhavo' ham'. This is Brahmasvarūpa or the Absolute Light of Pure Consciousness. This is Brahman showing his ownself to Himself as the 'I' first person singular number which cannot be generalised. This is itself the name of Brahma. As I when accosted answer 'It is I' and after giving my svarūpa give my other name, similarly these distinctions of 'I' and its name and form is only conventional and not real. 'Paramātmasvārūpaṃ tu sarvopādhivivarjitaṃ' ।
Caitanyamātmano rūpaṃ sarvaśāstresu Paṭhyate ॥

A—U—Ṃ Tat Sat

BIBLIOGRAPHY—BOOKS CONSULTED.

1. Vākyapadīyam—Brahmakāṇḍam—*Ācārya Śrī Bhartṛhari.*
2. Pūrva-Mimāṁsā—*By Dr. Ganganath Jha.*
3. Ślokavārtika—*By Dr. Ganganath Jha.*
4. The Āgamaśastra of Gauḍapāda—*Edited by Bidhusekhar Bhattacharyya.*
5. Tattvasaṁgraha—Vols. I & II—*Edited by B. Bhattacharyya.*
6. Brahmasiddhi—*Ācārya Maṇḍana Miśra.*
7. Śabara-Bhāṣya—*Vols. I & II—Mahamahopadhyay Ganganath Jha.*
8. Vyākaraṇa-Darśaner Itihāsa—*Gurupada Haldar.*
9. Śivādvaitainrṇaya—*Appayya Dīkṣita.*
10. Lectures on Pātañjala Mahābhaṣya—*Vols. I & II—P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri.*
11. The Śivasūtravimarśinī—*Kṣemarāja.*
12. Tantratattva—*Mahamahopadhyaya Śiva Chandra Vidyārnava.*
13. Śivādvaita of Śrīkaṇṭha—*S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri.*
14. Mahanirvaṇa Pantram—*Edited by Jagamohan Tarkalankara.*
15. Niruttaratantram—*Edited by Rasika Mohan Chattopadhyay.*
16. Tripurāsārabamuccaya—*Edited by Rasika Mohan Chattopadhyay.*
17. Rudrayāmalatantram—*Edited by Rasikamohan Chattopadhyay.*
18. Sāradātilakatantram—*Part II—Edited by Arthur Avalon.*
19. Nyāya-Darśana—*Vols. I to V—By Vātsyāyana.*
20. Mālinivījayatantram
21. Vijnāñabhairava
22. Svacchandatantram—*by Kṣemarāja.*
23. Īśvarapratyabhijñā—*Utpalācarya.*
24. The Pratyabhijñāvimarśinī—*Ācārya Abhinavagupta.*
25. The Pratyabhijñā—Hṛdayam—*by Kṣemarāja.*
26. Tantrāloka—*Ācārya Abhinavagupta.*
27. Studies in Śaiva-Siddhānta—*J. M. Nallaswami.*
28. Kāma-Kalā Vilāsa with Cid-Vallī—*Edited by Sadāśiva Miśra.*
29. Prapanca-Sāra with commentary by Padmapāda—*Edited by Arthur Avalon.*
30. Sāradā-Tilaka with commentary by Raghava Bhaṭṭa—*Edited by Jha Bakshi.*
31. Yoginī-hṛdayadīpikā—*Edited by Mahamahopadhyay Gopinath Kaviraj.*
32. Mātṛkābheda-Tantram—*Edited by Pandit Amareswar Thakur, M.A.,Ph.D.*
33. Sarvollāsa-Tantram-Śrīmat Sarvānanda—*Edited by Rashmohan Chakravorty.*
34. Ānanda-Laharī with commentary of Lakṣmīdhara—*Edited by Śrī Panchanan Sastri.*

CORRIGENDUM

In all pages	Incorrect	Correct
	Sphota	Sphoṭa
	Śaiva	Śaiva
	Sabda	Śabda
	Bhrtrhari	Bahrtihari
	Sākta	Śākta
	Pasyanti	Paśyantī
	Prakāsa	Prakāśa
	Vimarsa	Vimarsa
	Naiāikas	Naiyāyikas
	Mimāṃsakas	Mīmāmsakas
	Siva	Śiva
	Prakrti	Prakṛiti
	Purusa	Purusa
	Sānkhya	Sāṃkhya
	tāntrik	tāntrika
	Sakti	Śakti
	Rig-veda	Ṛg-vedȧ
	Chandra	Ċandra
	Surya	Sūrya
	Vaisnava	Vaiṣṇava
	Atharba veda	Atharva-veda
	upanisads	upanisads
In all pages	Incorrect	Correct
	Oṃ	Om
	Rishis	Rsis
	Bishnu	Visṇu
	Ganesh	Gaṇeśa
	Karma-Kānda	Karma-Kāṇḍa
	Pithasthan	Pīthasthāna
	Annȧpurna	Annapūrṇa
	Kāmaskhyā	Kamākhyā
	Jālamukhi	Jālāmukhī
	Ambika	Ambikā
	Mahadevi	Mahādevī
	Māhāvārata	Mahabhārata
	Rāmāyana	Rāmāyaṇa
	Parameswara	Parameśvara
	Kritibāsa	Kīrtivāsa
	Satapatha Brāhmana	Śatapathabrahmaṇa
	Pashupati	Paśupati
	Bhaba	Bhava
	Shruti	Sṛuti
	Smrīti	Smṛti

Page No.	Line	Incorrect	Correct
		Purāna	Purāna
		Dāpara-yuga	Dvāpara-yuga
		Sāstras	Śāstras
		Sankarāchārya	Saṅkarācārya
		Mādhyācharya	Madhācarya
		Vāchapati Misra	Vācaṣpati Miṣra
		Purānas	Puraṇas
		Gayatri	Gāyatrī
		yamala	yāmala
		yogini	yoginī
		Sāradatilak	Sāradātilaka
		Sree kula	Śrīkula
		Goudapada	Gaudapada
		Govindapadacharya	Govindapādācārya
		Srividya-ratna Sutra	Śrīvidyāratna Sūtra
		Bhatta	Bhatta
		Somananda	Somānanda
		Siva-drsti	Śivadṛsti
		Tantra-loka	Tantrāloka
		Pratyabhijna vimirsini	Pratyabhijñā vimarśinī
		'yogini-Hṛdaya-Dipika'	'yoginihṛdaya-Dīpikā
		Nitya-Ṣoḍasikātnava	Nityā Ṣoḍaṣikārṇava
		Sakti-Sangama	Śaktisaṃgama
		Parā-Vak	Parā-Vak
		Nayavaiśesika	Nyāyavaiśeṣika
		Ākāsa	Ākāśa
		Kumarila Bhatta	Kumārila Bhatta
		Tantravvrtika	Tantravārtika
		Sanaskārās	Samskāras
		Panini	Pānini
		Jnanam	Jñānam
		Harivansa	Haribaṃśa
		Bṛhmakando	Bṛhmakāṇda
		Pâshyanti	Paśyantī
		Vaikhari	Vaikharī
		Sadāshiva	Sadāśiva
		Sadāshivatattva	Sadāśivatattva
		Chit	cit
		Saktitattva	Śaktitattva
		Shivatattva	Śivatattva
		Suddha-vidyā	Śuddha vidyā
		Jivah	Jīvah
		Jnanasakti	Jñanaśakti
		Ichhasakti	Ichaśakti

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
1	23	Sādhan Sāstas	Sādhanaśastras
1	27	Āchāryas	Ācāryas
2	22-23	"vaidiki Tantriki chaiva dividhā kārtitā Sruti"	"vaidikī Tantriki caiva dividhā Kīrtita Śruti"
		Kullukvatta	Kullūkabhatta
2	24	Manu Sanhita	Manusamhita
3	6	Tibetian	Tibetan
3	6	Astrich	Ostrich
,,	10	Vils	Bhils
,,	13	was	were
,,	13	source	sources
,,	30	Durga	Durgā
4	26	Savaras	Śavaras
,,	,,	Kiratas	Kirātas
5	7	'Chandra'	'Candra'
,,	7	Surya	Sūrya
,,	8	fire God	firegod
5	10	'saraswati'	'Sarasvati'
,,	,,	Ratri	Rātri
,,	26	Linga	Liṇga
7	1	'Pancha-ma-kara'	'Pañca-ma-kāra
7	3	'Kundalini'	'Kuṇḍalini'
7	13	Devi-Sūkta	devī-Sūkta
,,	22	Mārkandya Purāna	Mārkaṇḍeya Puraṇa
,,	23	Kālika-Purana	Kālikā Puraṇa
8	3	Malinivijay	Mâlimīvijaya
,,	,,	Rudra-yamala	Rudra-yāmala
,,	23	Prawava	Praṇava
,,	27	Nada	Nāda
,,	27	Vidu	Bindu
9	30	mantradiksha	Mantradīkṣa
10	2	Vedāntik	Vedāntī
13	3-5	'Brahmānī kurute srsti, na tu Brahmā kadāchana, vaishnavi kurute sthiti, na tu Vishnu kadachana, Rudrāni kurute Nāsam na tu Rudra Kadāchana'	Brahmāṇī kurute sṛṣti, na tu Brahmā kadācana, vaiṣṇavī kurute ṣṭhiti na tu Viṣṇu kadācana Rudrānī kurute nāṣam, na tu Rudrah Kadācāna.
15	2-3	"Kṛite Srtuḳtamārgasayát, tretayang Smriti Sambhavab, Dwāpare tu Purānok-	Kṛte Srṭuktamārga syat, Tretāyāng Smṛti Sambhava Dvāpare tu purāṇok-

Pag. No	Line	Incorrect	Correct
15	2-3	taṃ, Kalau āgama Kevalam."	tam Kalou āgama Sammatah.
,, 15	26	'Eka-eva Rudra na dvitiyothasthe'	'Eka-eva Rudṛh na dvitiyotasthe'
15	27	Sukla-yaur veda	Śukla-yaurveda.
15	27	Sivāya	Śivāya
,,	28	Samkhabāyā	Sambhavāya
	28	cha	ca
16	29	Jogini	Yoginī
17	29	Srīvidāya-ratna Sutra	Śrīvidyāratna Sūtra
17	34	Laksmanadesika's 'Sarada-tilak	Lakṣmaṇadeśikā's 'Saradātilaka'
18	9	Punyananda	Pūrṇānanda
18	11	'Kāmakalā bilasa'	'Kāmakalāvilāsa'
,,	13	Amritānanda	Amṛtānanda
21	25	"Sarvvābhavesu Satrūpam	Sarvābhaveṣu Sadrūpaṃ
22	17	"Sarvvopādhya-vacchinnam	Sarvopādhya-vacchinnaṃ
22	22-23	Kālākāśadisām ekatvāt nityatvena avasthābhedābhābat ca Katham tesu	Kālākāśādiśāṃ ekatvāt nityatvena abasthābhedābhāvāt ca Kathaṃ teṣu gātiḥ
23	32	'Panchapandavas	'Pañcapaṇḍavas
24	7-9	"Samyogi dharma-bhedena dese ca parikalpite tesu desesu samamyan	"Saṃyogī dharmma-bhedena deṣe ca parikalpite tesu deśeṣu Sāmānyam
24	16	"Satyāsataṅ	Satyāsatyau
,,	16	Pratibhāvam	Pratibhāvaṃ
,,	17	Satyam	Satyaṃ
,,	18	Smṛta	Smṛtā
,,	27-28	"Tadeva Nityaur yasmin tattvam na vihannate"-(Patānjal Mahabhāsya	"Tadeva Nityaṃ yasmin tattavaṃ na Vihanyate-(Pātañ-jala Mahābhāṣya)
25	28	antyāparāprakrtiḥ	antyaparāprakḥtiḥ
,,	29	Praśanta	praśāntā
,,	29	cidekaghna	cidekaghanā
26	16	'Vikalpa Jnanam	Jñanam
,,	19	vastsūnyaḥ	vastuśūṅyah
26	27	"Ayam bandhāsuto yati khapuspa krta khekhara"	"Ayaṃ bandhāyasuto yāti Khapuṣpakṛtaśe-kharaḥ"
28		yātha-guṇaḥ	yathāguṇaḥ
29	16	varṇs	varṇah

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
29	16	vijnātah	vijñāta
35	1	'vāchaka'	vācaka
,,	3	'vāchya'	vācya
,,	10	'Jati'	Jāti
,,	16	'Tādātmyadhāśa'	Tādātmyādhyāsa'
37	28	Jnanyate	Jñāyate
,,	33	'Sabdāt Arthava Pratipadyāmahey	'Śabdāt Artham Pratipadyāmahe'
38	33	Sarvvairevābhidhiyate	Sarvvairevābhidyate
40	3	Śrotra paricchinna	Śrotraparicchinna
,,	4	Jamyennavā	Jamayennavā
,,	12-13	Sāsnā-taṅgula-Kuku-deakhura viṣāninam	Sāsnā-lāgūlakukuda-khura viṣāṇīnām
,,	19	'Sphutati arthoyas-matili sphotaḥ	'Sphuṭṭati arthoyas-māṭsphoṭaḥ
41	5	Śābarabhāsya	Śābarabhāṣya
,,	6	tadbhave	tadbhāve
42	19	Vyāpārākrama varthinaḥ	Vyāpārakṛama-vartinaḥ
43	14-15	Saṃskāroasvabm-rakam	Saṃskaro' śvas-maranaṃ
46	19	Sadhāva-Vyatirekan	Sadbhāva-Vyatirekaṃ
,,	21	Savarthabhudhisn	Svārthabuddhisu
48	8	Sabdanugamat	Śabdānugamāḍ
48	8	Artham	Arthaṃ
50	10	Maharsi	Maharṣi
,,	17	'Kaṅmaike Tattra Darsanāt"	"Karmaike Tatra Darśanāt"
,,	19	'Asthanat'	Asthānāt
,,	25	Sattautary cha Jougapaddāt	Sattautṛy ca Jaūgapadayāt
51	1	"Briddhischa Kartibhūmnasya	"vrddhiśca 'Kartribhūmnāsya'
,,	6	Paramadarśanang	Paramadarśanaṃ
52	2-3	"Ādityavat Yougapadyam"	Āḍityavaṭsu yaugapadyam
,,	12	"Adityavat Suh	"Ādityavaṭ su"
,,	14-16	Prativimbam yathānyatra sthitam toyakriyavasat Tatpravrittimi-vbatbeli Sa Dharmah Sphotanadayoh"	"Prativimbaṃ yathānyatra sthitaṃ toyakriyāvasāt tatpravṛittimiva-tveti Sa Dharmaḥ Sphotnodayoh
,,	25	'Barnātaramabikara'	'Varnataramavikāra
53	8	'Nadavrddhiparā"	"Nādavṛddhiparā"

Page No.	Line	Incorrect	Correct
53	21	Apauruseya	Apauruṣeya
,,	26	'Shāstradīpika	'Śaśtradīpika'
54	5	'Tādātma Sambandha	Tadātmya-sambandha
,,	31	Śabdabrahmavādcus	Śabdabrahmabadins
55	23-26	"Vāgevartham Paśyantī vāgjēvēti vāgārthaṃ nihitaṃ Saṃtanotivacaiv pravibhajyopabhunte	"Vāgevārthaṃ paśyantī vāgjibati vāgārthaṃ nihitaṃ Saṃtanotivāchaiva pravibhājyopabhuṅkte
57	8	Nirvikalpajnanaṃ	Nirvikalpajñanaṃ
,,	11	apprepension	apprehension
,,	18	Kaścidvimśatipadāni	Kaścidvīṃśatipadāni
,,	18	Kaścidtriṃśat	Kascittriṃsat
,,	19	Kaściccatvārimsat	Kaściccātvāriṃsat
,,	20	Sphotastāvāneva	Sphotāstāvāneva
,,	21	urddhih	urddhiḥ
,,	21	Dhavani	Dhvani
,,	31	Vedartham-pavṛṃhayet'	Vedarthamu-pabrṃhayet
58	3	'Ekāsharā	'Ekāṣkharā
,,	,,	'Akṣārāḥāmaā karāstvaṃ	'Akṣarāṇāīṇa kārastvaṃ
,,	3	Aksarānāmakāma kārosmi	Akṣarāṇāma —kāro'smi
59	17	Prajapati	Prajāpati
,,	29	asamat	asamād
,,	29	sā nuah	sapuṇaḥ
,,	30	Punah prāvisāt	puṇāḥ prāvisat
,,	32	tayāvāchā	tyāvācca
,,	33	Kincha ṛchoyajūmsḥi sāmāni chhandamsihi	kinca ṛco yajūṃṣi Sāmāni chandaṃsi
60	1	yajnān Prajāh Pastum	yajñān prajāḥ Paṣtum
,,	8	Vāchaiva	vācaiva
,,	9	jnāyate	jñayate
,,	9	Paramam Brahmah	Paramam Brahma
,,	14-12	Adhāre sarvvabhu-tānām sankhāvarttā-kramadder Sarvvama-vrtya tisthti	Ādhāre sarvvabhu-tanaṃsaṃkhyāvarttā-kramāddevi sarvamā-vṛtya tisthati
,,	,,	Kundalibhutāsār-panam	Kundalibhutāsar-pṇāṃ
,,	,,	Aṇgaśriyamupeasi	Aṇgaśriyamupeasī
,,	,,	Sarvvavedamai	Sarvvavedamayī
,,	,,	Devi	Devī
,,	,,	Suksmatara vibhuh	Sūkśmatara vibhuh

Page No.	Line	Incorrect	Correct
60	14-12	Swarūpiṁ Svarupini	Svarūpinī
,,	,,	"Sāradatilaka	Saradātilaka
,,	25	"Abhrānyeva	"Abhrāṇyeva
63	7	Anubiddhamivam artham Sabdena	Anbibiddhamiva jñānaṃ Sabdena
66	14	'Amirvachaniga'	'Anirvacanīya'
,,	22	"Suktyāvacchinna	"Śuktyavacchinna
,,	23	Chaitanya"	Caitanya"
,,	24	"anādibhāvara-pajnāna'	'anādibhāvarū—pajñānam'
67	6	parinamate	pariṇamate
,,	6	Advaita-Paribhasa	vedānta-paribhaṣā
68	8	nysta	nyṣta
,,	8	tapradiha	tadvadiha
,,	28-29	"viparyyayomithya jñnāaruadad rūpapratisthan"	viparyyayohmithyā jñanarū-papratisṭham
,,	29	Pātanjala yogadarsanam	pātañjala yogadaraśna
69	30	Nāhirvvacṁaiyasya	Nānirvvacanīyasya
70	6	"Bhāmati	Bhāmatī
,,	20	"Chidatmani	Cidātmani
,,	30	Siṣṭiḥ	Sṛṣṭiḥ
74	15	'Viparinam'	'Vipariṇāmāṁ'
,,	27	'Prakasa	Prakaśa
77	3	'upadan Karan'	'upadana Karana'
78	15-16	"Satyam jnanam Anantam Brahman'	Satyam jñanaṃ Anantaṃ Brahma
81	13-17	'Tena āntarikriya Śaktijnadeva svatshsiddha	'Tena antarikriya śakitjñānādeva svataḥsiddhā
,,		Prānapūryyasstaka Kramena Sarīramapi Sañcaramānā	Prāṇapūryyāṣṭaka -Kramena Śariramapi Saṇcaramāna
,,		mayapade'pi prāmāṇasya pratyaksyādervisayah	māyāpade'pi prāmāṇysya pratyakṣāderṿisayaḥ
,,	29-31	"Yatrajñānam Khyākaya Śrita Satī parairapyūpa lakṣyeta tayanya jñāna mūhyate	'yatrajñānaṃ Kriākāyāśṛita Sati parairapyupa lakṣyeta tayānya jñānamukhyate
82	16	Sraprakāsa	Svaprakāśa
83	1-2	Śabdānugamtitrte jñānam Śarvam	Ś·bdāungamāḍrte jñānaṃ Sarvaṃ
,,	27	jñānaūca	jñānaṇca

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
85	5	'Satta'	Satva
86	17	buddheravystiriktam	buddheravyatikritam
,,	15-17	mukhyaprākāśarū- payava. .jrmbharyati	mukhyaprakāśarū- pa eva. .jṛmbhayati
87	2	bhava	bhāva
89	16	'Srsiksa'	Srsrksā
90	14	'Kāla	Kaḷ
,,		Kalanam	Kalanaṃ
,,	19-20	Kspojñānam	Kṣpajñanam
		. . bhogkaranam	bhogikaraṇaṃ
		Śabdanam	Sabdanaṃ
		Svātna layīkarananca	Svāṭmayalīkaraṇañca
91	22	Atmalayeekaranạ	Ātmalayịkarana
93	22	dṛsyate	dṛśyate
	23	advstoparatam	adṛṣṭoparatam
		. . yuktataram	yuktataraṃ
,,	26	Kryāsaktih	Kriāśaktiḥ
	26	tattvānāūca	tatvānāñca
94	17	'Avyakrita Kala'	Avyākṛita Kalā
,,	22	Sambid	Saṃvid
		bahismatmāyagar- bhibhutan Krama	bahiṣaṭmāgar- bhivūtau Krama
		Kraman	Kramānah
97	11	'Nisedhvyapararūpa	'Nisedhavyāpārarūpa
97	16	'Śaktih'	'Śaktiḥ'
98	27	Lilabatta	Līlāvattu
100	2-4	"Vaikharyyamadha- māyāsca Pasyantā- scaitadadbhūtam.	'Vaikharyyāmadhya- māyāśca Paśyantyā- ścaitadadabhutaṃ.
		Anckatirthabhé- dāyāstraiya	Anekatīrthabhe- dāyastraiā
100	18	"Nirvishaya	Nirviṣaya
100	23	Paraih Sambedyaṃ	Praiḥ Saṁvedyaṃ
100	9	Mātrikā	Māṭṛka
,,	10	Varnas	Varṇas
,,	17-19	Samivesinī	Samniveśinī
,,		Kesāṇcit	Kesañcit
,,	23	Ikahana	Ikaṣaṇa
102	6	Visuddha	viśuddhā
,,	7	Akramāṃ vācam	Akramaṃ vāchaṃ
	15	'Samāviṣṭajneyakāra	'Samāviṣṭajñeyākārā
,,	20	Antabhāvanivāpanno	Antaḥvāṇīvapanno
,,	21	Sabdasamūkaḥ	Sabdasaṃjñaka
10	15	'Yattwa Prākasha	'Tattvaprakāśa'
,,	18	Jūāna Kryākhya	jñānakriyāhhya
,,	19	ya Prasarstam	yaḥ Pṛasarastaṃ

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
105		'Siddhantahṛdya'	'Siddhantahṛdaya'
,,	6-7	jūānakṛyākhyenyak-tudye Śakticchodre-kamasuute	jñānakṛiyākḥyanoḳ-ṭulye Śakṭyudre-kamaśnute
105	18	Patur Saktih	Patyur Śaktih
		Parasūkṣwa	Parāsukṣmā
,,	34	Prabhuddātmā	Prabhuddhātmā
107	1	'Yadvhumika Sarvadarśanasthiya	'Taḍbhūmika Sarvadarśanasthitaḥ'
,,	26	'Anadimidham'	'Anādinidhanam'
109	10	Akshara	Akśara
109	16	'Aham Prajāeyma'	Ahaṃ Prajāyema'
,,	16	"Aham Bhahushāyama	Ahaṃ Bahusyāma
110	25	'Idanta'	Idantā
111	3	'Prakryāyagatsyatah'	'Prakriyājagatoyataḥ'
,,	12	(Chaitanyamātā -Shiva Sutravimar-shince')	Caitanyamātmā—*Ś*iva -Sūtravimarśinī
,,	22	Brahmanch	Brahmaṇah
112	5	Chamatkṛate	Camaṭkṛte
,,	6	Parāmisyate	Parāmiṣyate
,,	28	Chaitaryame Kairaṭmā	Caitanyamekaivātmā
113	15	'Pratyava-marsha	Pṛatyavamarṣa
,,	16	Chinmātre	Cinmātre
,,	17	Swavābedasya	Svabhāvavedasya
114	9	Vāchaiva	Vācaiva
114	11-12	'Vāj vāi Ajo vacho vai Prajāh Vishvakarmā jajanā	vāg vai Ajo vāco vai Prajāḥ viśvakarmā jajāñā"
115	18	Matrika	Matrkā
116	31-34	Sreemad Parama-shivasya Punah Biswottirnabisurā-tmakaparamānanda mayaprakasaikagha-nasya......bastutaḥ amyat	Srimaḍ Paramaśivasya Punaḥ Viśvottīrṇa-viśvātmakaparamānanda māyāprakāsaikagha nasya............ vastutaḥ anyaṭ
117	1	Kinchit........	Kiñciṭ........
117	1-2	Sreeparamashiva Bhattaraka nānāvaichitrasahasraih	Śriparamaśiva-bhaṭṭāraka nānāvaicitryasahasraiḥ
119	2-6	Bhidamānāt Parāvin dorayaktārtmaravo.... tam..visāradāh' Śābdartham Śabdamityaparh	Bhidyamānāt Parāvin-doravyaktātmkarāvo taṃ..viśāradāḥ Śabdārthaṃ Sabdamityapareḥ

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
119	2-6	Sarvvabhūtāūam	Sarvvabhūtānām
		Sabdabrahmcti	Śabdabrahmeti
		. . Kundalirūpam	Kuṇḍalirūpaṃ
		Prāninām	Prāṇināṃ
		dehamadhyagām	dehamadhyagaṃ
119	22	Sah evo	Sa eva
,,	23	Śabda	Śabda
,,	,,	(Prapānchasara)	(Prapañcasāra)
120	2	Saradā	Sarādā
,,	6	Sabda Brahman	Śabdabrahman
,,	7	Sarvvabhūtānām	Sarvvabhūtānāṃ
,,	,,	. . . . tiṣhhati	. . . . tiṣṭhati
,,	8	Kundalibhūtasarpānām	Kuṇḍalībhūtasarpāṇāṃ
,,	11	Sākṣat	Sākṣāt
,,	11	Suksmātara	Sūkṣmatarā
,,	12	dhama. . Sabda	dhāma. . . . Śabda. .
122	32	Parāsaktiūrpa chitirevo	Parāśaktirūpa citireva
		Bhagobato. .	Bhagavato. .
,,	33	Shivavāttārakābhima	Śivabhaṭṭārakābhinna
,,	,,	Pratyabhijwabodya'	Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya.
12	1	'Purnāhanta	Pūrṇāhanta
,,	8	Kālasakti	Kālaśakti
,,	32	Sreemat	Śrīmat
,,	,,	Paramasivashya	Paramaśivasya
	33	. . Biswottirua-	Viśvottīrṇa-
		biswātṃaka-para-	Viśwātmaka-
,,	34	mānandamayo-	paramānandamaya-
	,,	prakasaikaghanashya	prakāśaikaghanasya
124	1-3	Anvaṭ Kinchiṭ	Anyat Kiṇcit
		grāhyam grāhakam	grāhyaṃ grāhakaṃ
		va; api tu sree	vā; api tu Srī
		Paramasivattāraka	Paramasīvavattāraka
		eva ithan nānā	eva ittham nānā
		vaichitṛasahasrena	vaicitṛasahasṛeṇa
128	3	'Niskala'	Niṣkala
131	16	Chitrūpini	Citrūpiṇi
131	22	Chaitanayādhyāsena	Caitanyādhyāsena
,,	23	Sūkshmā	Sūkṣmā
133	7	'Ābhasa'	'Ābhāsa'
,,	8	'Āvasavād'	'Ābhāsavāda'
,,	10	Ābāsana	'Ābhāsana
,,	11-12	(vaṛtamānābavāsānām	vartamānāvabhāsanaṃ
		vābānāmabavāsanam,	bhavānāmavābhāsanaṃ
		Aṇtakitabatānāmeva	Antaḥsthitavaṛtinameva
135	4-6	Pūrnamadaḥ	Pūrṇamadaḥ
		Purnamidaṃ	Pūrṇamidaṃ

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
135	4-6	Pūrnātpurmamuda- chavte	Pūrṇātpūrṇanmdu- cayate
		Pūruṛsya	Pūrṇsya
		Pūruamādāya	Pūrṇamādāya
		Pūrnamevāvashishyate	Pūrṇamevavaśisyate
137	4-5	'Sadasatvyām	'Sadasadbhyāṃ
		amirvāchyā	anirvācya
		Mithyābhuta	Mithābhūtā
		Sanātani'	Sanātanī'
138	27	(Brahmakhela idaṃ Sarvaṃ, Sarvam Khallidaṃ Brahma)	(Brahmakhelā idaṃ Sarvaṃ, Sarvaṃ Khalhidaṃ Brahma)
139	10	the	Achārya
,,	,,	Sankara	Śaṇkara
,,	,,	Maya	Māya
140	2-3	(Mahākālīpralénasya Mahakala Prakirtitaḥ, . . Pratenasya Mahākātiprakrititaḥ	(Mahākālīpralīnasya Mahakalaḥ Prakīrtitaḥ, Pralīnasya Mahākālīprakīrtitaḥ)
141	1	'Shantam	śāntaṃ
142	1	'Hridaya'	'Hṛdaya'
143	30-33		
,,	,,	Shivatattva	Śivatattva
146	20	(Amarsha)	Amarṣa
150	7	'Avolokitesvara	Avolokiteṣvara
,,	31	(Nishedhavyapārarupa Saktiḥ)	(Niṣedhavyāpārarūpā Śaktiḥ)
151	10	Aishvartattva or Iśhvaratattva	Aiśvaryatattva or Iśvarattattva Suddha-vidya
153	22	(Sāmādhikaravya)	(Sāmānadhikaraṇya)
154	6	(Adhikarama)	(Adhikaraṇa)
,,	14	(Parāparadabha)	(Parāparadaśā)
,,	15	(Vedāvedavimar- shantnaka	'Vedāvedavimar- ṣanātmaka
,,	26	Sarvomamayam vivah	Sarvam mamayam vivāvaḥ
155	31	(Sarvākatayagittam Kriyāṣaktiḥ)	(Sarvakarayogitvam Kriyāsaktiḥ)
157	1-314	(Sarvābhih Saktivih Samāvistanca . . Pravibhāgarupancha)	(Sarvābhih Śaktibhiḥ Samāviṣtaṇca. . pravibhāgarūpaṇca)
157	31	Chaitanyādhyasenā Sūkshmāsthitā	Caitanyādhyāsena Sūkṣmāsthita
160	6	'Nimesha'.	'Nimeṣa'
161	26	(ci-deka-rupa)	(cidekarūpa)

Page No	Line	Incorrect	Correct
162	14	Ashuddha	Aśuddha
163	19	Sushuspti	Suṣpti
,,	20	Turiya	Turiya
,,	23	Nirvishcsajnanam	Nirviśesajñanaṃ
164	2	Jaagaṭprapancha	Jagatprapañca
164	21-22	(Parināma hi upadānasamasattaka-Kāryyāpattih)	Pariṇāmo hi upādānasamasattaka-Kāryāpattiḥ)
164	29	(Vivarttohiupādāna-vishmaIsattaka-Kāryyapattih)	(Vivartohiupādāna-viṣama-sattāka-Kāryyāpattiḥ)
In all pages		Jivah	Jīvah
166	17	(namarupamātra)	nāmarūpamātra
167	19	..Asvarūpeāroponc chāsya-shaktāyah-satatsthitah	..asvarūpārūpena-cāsya Śaktyā satatotthitaḥ
168	3-5	(Māyā vibhada-budhir- nijangsha gātesu-Nikhilavaiveshu, nityaṃ tasya Nirankushavibhalam	(Māyā vibhedabudhir-nijaṁśa jāteṣu nikhilavaibhaveṣu nityaṃ tasya Nirankuśavibhavāṃ
186	10-11	(Vhedabhireva Bhāveshu ..Māyā-Shaktyeva Vidyatyane Vidyeshvara yatha)	(Bhedabhireva Bhāveṣu Māyā Saktyeva Vidyate, Vidyeśvara yatha)
170	12	'Purnattva'	'Purṇatva'
171	24	(Parichhna)	(Parichinna)
171	28	'Sā-nītyatāsyas-shakti -nikrishya	'Sā nityā tasyā Śaktinikriṣya
173	7	Sutasaṇhita	Sūtasaṃhitā
,,	8-10	'..yattisthati Sarvesāṃ..bhutanam, Shakiraghatadi	..yattiṣṭhati Sarveṣāṃ..bhūtānāṃ Śarīraghatādi
,,	16	Shri Kumar	Śrī Kumāra
,,	17	'Yattva-&rakasha'	'Tattva-Prakāśa
,,	19-21	'Yatattvāt santa tatvamiti tato biduḥ yatattvaṃ deshatoḥ	'Tatatvāt santa-tatvamiti tato viduḥ Tatatvaṃ deśataḥ
• 174	7	(Parichchheda)	Paricceda
,,	14	(Purnāhantā)	Pūrṇāhanta
,,	32-34	Svantantra chiti swatantrā visva Siddhi hetu	Svatantra Citi svatantrā visvasiddhihetu

Page No.	Line	Incorrect	Correct
176	18-20	'Yoga-vāsista'	Yoga vāśiṣṭa'
		'Svamarichivaladbhuta	'Svamarīcibalaḍḍhūta
		Yalitagney Kanah iva	jalitagne Kaṇaḥ iva
		Sabāḥ. . . .	Sarvāḥ. . . .
		Iivahrāshayaḥ'	Jívarāśayaḥ'
178	3-4	'Purnattyabhāluna	Pūrṇātvābhavena
		Parinitattvat	Parimitatvāt
		Anuttoaṃ'	Aṇutvaṃ
181	28-28	'Evaṃ Kinchit Kartrit-tram yat Maya Karyaṃ tattra Kinchittvavishis-tam yaṭ Kaṛtrittvaṃ visheyaṃ, tattra vayapriyamādā,	Evaṃ Kiñciṭ Katṛitvam yaṭ Maya Kāryaṃ tatra Kiñcitvaviśiṣṭaṃ yaṭ Kaṛtritvam viśeṣyam tatra vyāpriyamānā
		Kalā. . . .	Kala. . . . .
		Idaniṃ vishasanavago	viśeṣaṇavago
		yah kinchidityukṭo	yaḥ kiñcidityukto
		jneyah	jñeyaḥ
		Kāryancha taṃ yavat	Kāryaśca tam yāvat
		. . . . tavadesa eva	. . . . tāvadeṣa
		Sukḥa-duhkha-mohatmaka	Sukha-duḥkha-mohātmaka
		-voggya-vishesānu-ṣyntarya	bhogya-viśeṣānu-syntasya
		Sāmāmgamāttrsya	sāmānyamātrsya
		tatguna sāmyāparah	tadguṇasāmyaparaḥ nāmāna
		namnah prakriti	prakṛiti
		tattvasya sarga iti-'	tattvasya sarga iti-
		voktri-vogyayugalasya	bhoktṛbhogya-yugalasya
		Samameva Kalā ttvattaḥsṛisteḥ	Samameva Kalā-ttvaitisṛṭi
181	29-21	Vogyam cha vokṭaraṃ	bhogaya ca bhoktāraṃ
		Ca.	ca. . . . . .
		. . Saṃvedyamattrṃ	Saṃvedyamātraṃ
		yaṭ sukha-duhkha-vimohatah	yat suhka-duḥkha-vimohataḥ
		votṣyate.	bhotsyate. . . . . .
		taṭsamyatṃa-kamaditah	tatsāmyātma-kamāditaḥ
184	9-10	Yaḍeva Prakriti tattavaṃ. .	Tadeva Prakṛitita-tattavaṃ
185	14	'Antaḥkarana'	'Antaḥkaraṇa'
,,	23	'Alochana'	'Alochana'
186	5	'Vavachchidan manas	'Vyavaccpeda manaḥ

Page No.	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
186	5	lakhayati'	laksyati'
188	2	Vedyasanparke kaluse	Vedyasaṁparke kaluṣe
,,	3	punprakashe Anatmni	Puṁprakāśe anātmani
,,	,,	..Shuktan rajatabhimanabaṭ	Śuktau rajatabhimanavat
,,	4	..Kritakattvṃ	Kṛtakatvam
	5	asyukttam	asyuktam
	5	Sankhyadya..yajjate	Sāṁkhyasya..yujyate
,,	6-8	..aharivimarshamaya-taum-chhti vyam Katrittvamati tasya ichhamah, yatcha Suddham vimarsha Smattrachamṭkara-rupaḥ aham iti	..ahaṁvimaraṣ-mayatāmichativayaṃ Kṛtritvamiti tasya ichāmaḥ, Taccha Śuddham vimarṣa Svātmacamaṭkāra-rupaḥ aham iti
190	6-7	"Tasya Kriya tamo-maya murtih manas uchyate vikalpkaro"	"Tasya Kriya tamo-māyā ṁurtiḥ manḥ ucyate vikalpakāro"
194	19-21	Kriyasakli pradhanayah Sabda Sabdarthakara-nam Prakriterbindu-ruinyah Sabdabrahma-bhavaṭ aram	Kṛiyaśakti prādhānaya Śabda Śabdarthakara-ṇam Prakṛtervindu-rupiṇyah Śabdābrahma bhāvāṭ param"
195	8	Ashabda gagaṭ	Aśabda gagaṭ
,,	13-14	"Sarvva-Śhabdarupa-taya Sarvva Sabda-grahyataya	Śarvva Śabdarūpatayā Sarvva Sabda-grahyatayā
,,	31-33	"Sakalabhubanada-yasthitilayamayatila binodyuktah Antartinabimarsah Patu Mahesah Prakashamatra taṇnḥ	"Sakalabhuvanāda-yasthitilayamayātitā-vinodyuktah Antarlīnavimarṣaḥ pātu Maheśaḥ Prakaśamatra tanuḥ"
196	3	Kamakameswarī	Kāma Kāmeśvari
196	31-43	"A-karah Sarva-varuagrayah Prakaśah..Sivaḥ Ha-Karonotyah Vimarśakhyah	Akāraḥ Sarva-varṇāgryaḥ Prakāśaḥ Śivaḥ Ha-Kāıantyaḥ Vimarṣākhya
198	3-5	..Nitoiayutan Parasparam Śivasakti-niaya betan trivījarūpena	..Nityayuktau Parasparam Śivaśakti-mayāvetau tribijarūpeṇa
199	15-16	Sarvopadhibibarjitam Chaitamymatammo rūpam sarva sastresu Pathyate	Sarvopadhivivaryitam Caitanyamātman rūpaṃ sarvaśāstreṣu Paṭhyate

Distributors
FIRMA K. L. MUKHOPADHYAY
CALCUTTA 12 * 1964